DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 181 162 UD 020 118

AUTHOR Fitzpatrick, Joseph P.: Gurak, Douglas T.
TITLE Hispanic Intermarriage in New York City: 1975. Monograph No. 2.
INSTITUTION Fordham Univ., Bronx, N.Y. Hispanic Research Center.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Mental Health (DHEW), Rockville, Md. Center for Minority Group Mental Health Problems.
PUB DATE 79
GRANT 1P01-MH30569-01
NOTE 109p.; Not available in paper copy due to institution's restriction

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Acculturation: Cubans: Demography: Dominicans: Intergroup Relations: *Intermarriage: *Marriage: Migration Patterns: Population Trends: Puerto Ricans: Socioeconomic Status: *Spanish Americans: Spanish Speaking
IDENTIFIERS *New York (New York)

ABSTRACT

This report seeks to determine trends in assimilation among Hispanic Americans with special attention to the question of intermarriage. After reviewing the different Hispanic groups found in New York City, the report indicates that intermarriage rates (with the exception of those for Puerto Ricans and first-generation Dominicans) are high among Hispanics. Most of these intermarriages take place with members of other Hispanic groups but, it is reported, the second generation has witnessed a marked increase in marriages with non-Hispanics. It is also noted that exogamy is generally associated with higher occupational status, a factor especially true for brides. Other data concerning intermarriage are presented, and recommendations are made concerning administrative and research needs. Bibliography and tables elucidating demographic and marriage patterns are included. (Author/WP)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

JAN 2 - 1980

ED181162

HISPANIC INTERMARRIAGE IN NEW YORK CITY: 1975

by

Joseph P. Fitzpatrick and Douglas T. Gurak

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Lloyd H. Rogler
Hispanic Research Center, Fordham Univ.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Monograph Number Two produced by
the Hispanic Research Center.
Lloyd H. Rogler, Director

CDC 201185

HISPANIC RESEARCH CENTER
FORDHAM UNIVERSITY
BRONX, NEW YORK 10458

MONOGRAPH SERIES

Monograph #1

Puerto Ricans and Health: Findings from New York City
by Jose Oscar Alers (1978)

Monograph #2

Hispanic Intermarriage in New York City: 1975
by Joseph P. Fitzpatrick and Douglas T. Gurak (1979)

The Hispanic Research Center is supported by Research Grant 1R01 MH30569-01 from the National Institute of Mental Health, Center for Minority Group Mental Health Programs.

Copyright © 1979 by Hispanic Research Center.

CONTENTS

Foreword vii
Acknowledgments ix

I. INTERMARRIAGE AND ASSIMILATION 1
A. Studies of Hispanic Intermarriage 3
B. Research Design and Overview 9

II. HISPANIC POPULATIONS IN NEW YORK CITY 13
A. Puerto Ricans 15
B. Dominicans 18
C. Cubans 23
D. South and Central Americans 25
E. Summary 28

III. HISPANIC INTERMARRIAGE PATTERNS IN NEW YORK CITY 31
A. Levels of Hispanic Outgroup Marriage 32
B. Selectivity of Intermarriage Patterns 34
C. Social Distances Among Ethnic Groups 37
D. The Puerto Rican Situation: 1949 to 1975 41
E. Summary 46

IV. OCCUPATION AND INTERMARRIAGE 47
A. Occupational Distributions 48
B. Intermarriage and Social Mobility 53
C. Summary 58

V. INTERMARRIAGE DETERMINANTS AND CONSEQUENCES 59
A. Background Variables 59
B. Multivariate Analysis 67
C. Intermarriage as a Determinant 74
D. Determinants of Residential Dispersion 77
E. Summary 77

VI. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 83
A. Major Conclusions 83
B. The Puerto Rican Intermarriage Pattern 86
C. Recommendations 88

References 93

TABLES

1. Outgroup Marriage Rates for Hispanic Males in the United States, by Generation, 1970 6
2. Total Number of Persons and Total Number of Hispanic Persons Marrying in New York City, 1975 14
3. Puerto Rican Population in New York City by Borough, 1970 16
4. Occupational Level of Dominican Grooms and Brides, New York City, 1975 21
5. Civil Status of All Dominicans in the United States, 14 Years Old and Over, by Generation, 1970 22
6. Percentage of All Women of Cuban Origin Married to Non-Cubans, in Selected Locales, 1970 24
7. Hispanic Outgroup Marriages, by Ethnic Group, Sex, and Generation, New York City, 1975 33
8. Distribution of Ethnicity of Spouses for Hispanic Brides and Grooms, New York City, 1975 35
9. Outgroup Marriage Choices of Hispanics, New York City, 1975 . . . 38
10. Distribution of Types of Marriages of Second-Generation Hispanics, New York City, 1975 39
11. Social Distance Matrix by Generational Status of Groom, New York City, 1975 42
12. Comparison of 1975 Puerto Rican Outmarriage Rates with Those of 1959 and 1949 and with All Foreign-Stock Marriages during 1908-12, by Generation 44
13. Percent Distribution of Students for Five Hispanic Ethnic Groups, New York City, 1975 49
14. Occupation of Brides by Ethnic Group and Generation, New York City, 1975 50

15. Occupation of Grooms by Ethnic Group and Generation, New York City, 1975 51

16. Occupation of Hispanic Brides and Grooms by Outmarriage Status and Ethnicity, New York City, 1975 54

17. Occupational Differences between Spouses by Outgroup Marriage Status and Ethnicity, New York City, 1975 56

18. Background Variables by Ethnicity for All Generations, New York City, 1975 62

19. Background Variables by Ethnicity for the Second Generation, New York City, 1975 63

20. Distribution of Hispanic Marriages by Ethnicity and Borough, New York City, 1975 65

21. Zero Order Correlations Between Exogamy and Borough of License 68

22. Regression of Exogamy on Background Factors for All Ethnic Groups: Test for Interaction 70

23. Regression of Outgroup Marriage Indicators on Background Variables for Brides of Each Ethnic Group, New York City, 1975 72

24. Regression of Outgroup Marriage Indicators on Background Variables for Grooms of Each Ethnic Group, New York City, 1975 75

25. Regression of Occupations on Exogamy and Background Variables for Brides and Grooms, New York City, 1975 78

26. Zero-Order Correlations between Living in an Ethnically Dispersed Setting and Background Variables for Puerto Rican, South American, and Dominican Brides and Grooms 80

FOREWORD

Fordham University's Hispanic Research Center takes pleasure in presenting its second monograph to the interested and concerned reader. This monograph reports the findings of a comparative study conducted by the center to examine the intermarriage patterns of the major Hispanic groups in New York City. In bringing new data to bear upon some of the critically important questions associated with such marriages, the study makes a double contribution: it provides an empirically grounded, systematic data base which documents the patterns of ingroup and outgroup marriages among Hispanics; and it delineates the role played by the social structure in this context. Thus, the study, besides increasing our understanding of the dynamics of intergroup marriage, adds to the growing descriptive profile of Hispanic groups in the United States.

Marriage is a contractual legal relationship signifying intricate reciprocal obligations between a man and a woman; its intimacy makes it one of the most important primary relationships in society. It entails at least a rudimentary division of labor and a sharing of common experience; it is a compelling fact in the life cycle of most persons. It is, in brief, a basic human institution. Based on these criteria, the authors conceive of intermarriage as a powerful indicator of the broader process of assimilation. A legacy of important research and theorizing supports their position.

The authors also consider intermarriage as an important dimension of intergroup relations. As their study points out, this dimension is present only when structural conditions do not inhibit the interaction of members of different ethnic groups at many societal levels. By analyzing marriage records the authors have established a base line of findings relevant to the point of entry into marriage as an institution, findings which have meaning in terms of assimilation and in terms of the structure of intergroup relations. The monitoring of marriage records, therefore, provides an index of the changing patterns of intergroup relations and may likewise prove to be one of the best sources of information on the incorporation of ethnic groups into American society. In this regard, the contrast provided by Fitzpatrick's (1966) earlier study documenting

significant increases from first to second generation in outgroup marriages among Puerto Ricans and the present study showing no such increases leads to challenging questions regarding the assimilation of Puerto Ricans and their integration into the structure of the intergroup environment.

Because the study focuses upon marriage as a fundamental institution, of relevance to broader societal parameters and to the interpersonal world of daily life, no special effort is required to raise questions which on the surface have mental health implications. Mental health in its broader aspects touches upon all human institutions and, certainly, marriage and its corollary, the family, are the most fundamental of these institutions. From a less global and a more interpersonal perspective, intermarriage brings members from different ethnic groups into the conditions of intimacy already described. Other studies consistently show that marked differences in the social characteristics of the spouses—such as age, education, and religion—are conducive to divorce. Does this pattern extend to ethnic differences between spouses? Or are there mitigating factors conditioning marital stability and instability to be found in the cultural similarities and differences presented by the spouses? Thus, are marriages between different nationalities of Hispanics more stable than those between Hispanics and non-Hispanics?

The present study explores these and other questions and constitutes—as other studies in the Hispanic Research Center's series—an attempt to fill the gap in our knowledge about the conditions and needs of the Hispanic community in the United States. It was to attain this objective that the Hispanic Research Center was established at Fordham University in 1977, under a grant from the National Institute of Mental Health, to work toward five major objectives: (1) to conduct interdisciplinary research on priority issues relevant to the mental health of the Hispanic population, (2) to increase and upgrade the number of Hispanic scholars experienced in doing research in the mental health related disciplines, (3) to provide technical assistance to Hispanic behavioral scientists, professionals, and organizations working to remedy mental health problems in Hispanic communities, (4) to develop meaningful links between individual Hispanic researchers and between these researchers and persons involved in the formulation and implementation of Hispanic relevant public policy, and (5) to disseminate information on the mental health of the Hispanic population.

The presentation of this much needed study on the outgroup marriage patterns of New York City's Hispanic populations will, we are certain, enhance our understanding of the Hispanic experience in the United States.

Fordham University — *Lloyd H. Rogler*
July 1979

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The research that made this monograph possible was sponsored by the Hispanic Research Center of Fordham University. Lloyd H. Rogler, director of the center, encouraged the project from its onset, placed the resources of the center at the project's disposal, and critically read the manuscript. David Dinkins, City Clerk of the City of New York, and his helpful staff provided access to the marriage records. Data from the 20,161 marriage records were collected and coded by an able team consisting of Leonor Lorenzi, William Rodriguez, Lloyd Rogler, Jr., and Alexander Sanchez. John Walsh of the Psychology Department of Fordham, and Rosemary Santana Cooney of the Hispanic Research Center and Fordham's Department of Sociology and Anthropology, provided invaluable assistance in working out the statistical design. Leonard Correale and William Moss assisted in the computer operations. Marjorie O'Connor typed numerous drafts of the manuscript and Ana Maria Diaz designed the monograph's cover. Stasia Madrigal, editor of the Hispanic Research Center, performed the task of converting numerous awkward sentences and paragraphs into clearly readable prose. All of this took place smoothly thanks to the efforts of Elizabeth Ospina, the center's administrative assistant, who coordinated almost all phases of the project.

We assume full responsibility for the analytical strategy chosen and for the substantive content of this monograph. To the extent that readers profit from this report, the credit belongs to all the persons who worked on it. For those left confused or wanting a clearer exposition we alone deserve the blame.

New York City
July 1979

Joseph P. Fitzpatrick
Douglas T. Gurak

HISPANIC INTERMARRIAGE IN NEW YORK CITY: 1975

11

x

I. INTERMARRIAGE AND ASSIMILATION

This monograph presents a description of the intermarriage patterns created by the sum of all marriages by members of New York City's diverse Hispanic ethnic groups in 1975. This description, along with an analysis of the social factors associated with various types of outgroup marriage, is intended to increase our empirical understanding of the social situation of Hispanics in New York City.

Intermarriage is one of the many factors that reflect the extent of a group's assimilation. By assimilation we do not mean a one-way process by which one group loses its ethnic identity and assumes that of another. This definition leads to confusion since it does not adequately reflect the complexity and the mutual give-and-take of real assimilation processes. By assimilation we mean a long and intricate set of social processes which relate to modification of the typical behavior of a group or individual and to changes in the structural location of a group vis-a-vis other groups. It can be a socially and politically sensitive issue: one can perceive assimilation of a group as a positive or a negative occurrence depending on one's attitude toward a particular ethnic group and on one's understanding of the potential of alternative means of improving the social, economic, and political position of an ethnic group. For example, Puerto Ricans who favor independence for their island would tend to see assimilation as a corrosive process leading to the destruction of their ethnic institutions. Others have seen it as a beneficial blending of diverse cultural groups (Gordon, 1964). Still others point to the important role strong ethnic institutions have played in advancing the economic position of immigrant groups (Petersen, 1970).

Those who see assimilation as a one-way process emphasize the dependency of the minority group and frame the issue in terms of a dual outcome: a group either retains its identity or loses it. In reality, assimilation involves change for all groups concerned. Viewed as the process of reducing the social distances separating groups, assimilation takes place as different groups become more similar in behavior, more likely to interact with each other. This process entails change for the groups concerned, with the amount of change for a particular group

depending on many factors; the key ones, perhaps, being the relative size and concentration of the groups and the vitality of their ethnic institutions. The main point to keep in mind is that if different groups live in a common society, then assimilation processes will change all groups.

Many of the changes involved in the assimilation process can be measured in objective fashion; that is, we need not assign a positive or negative evaluation to the assimilation. Gordon (1964: 70-71) has provided us with a thorough categorization of the dimensions of assimilation. The first step, acculturation, occurs when everyday cultural or behavioral patterns change, such as dress habits, household schedules, or religious behavior. The second step, structural assimilation, occurs when the societal networks begin to overlap to a significant degree; that is, when large-scale face-to-face interaction exists among different groups in neighborhoods, clubs, places of work, schools, and other institutions. The third major form of assimilation is amalgamation or marital assimilation — large-scale intermarriage between persons of different ethnic groups.

Any two individuals from different ethnic backgrounds can meet, become attracted to each other, and marry. For intermarriage to occur on a large scale, however, requires structural assimilation. If members of different groups are not routinely interacting — in local neighborhoods, at places of work, in clubs — on a primary group level, then high rates of intermarriage will not occur. Because intermarriage on a large scale requires structural assimilation to have occurred or to be advanced, it is a powerful indicator of overall assimilation or reduction in the social distance separating ethnic groups.

In addition to requiring structural assimilation to predate it, and to being correlated with acculturation and decreases in prejudice and discrimination, intermarriage constitutes, by definition, the most intimate form of contact between members of distinct ethnic groups. Intermarriage also means that parts of different kinship systems are brought into contact. Robert Park and Ernest Burgess (1921: 735), two of sociology's seminal thinkers, put the importance of such primary contacts into perspective:

> As social contact initiates interaction, assimilation is its final perfect product. The nature of the social contacts is decisive in the process. Assimilation naturally takes place most rapidly where contacts are primary, that is, where they are the most intimate and intense, as in the area of touch relationship, in the family circle and in intimate congenial groups. Secondary contacts facilitate accommodations, but

do not greatly promote assimilation. The contacts here are external and too remote.

Again we emphasize the two-way process involved in assimilation and repeat that assimilation involves much more than a minority changing its ways in order to be accepted by a majority. This may occur in the case of some individuals or even groups when they are small or dispersed. However, when the minority groups are large and when they possess functioning basic institutions, assimilation indexes change in all parts of society. Park (1930: 281) made this point clearly when he defined assimilation as "the name given to the process or processes by which peoples of diverse racial origins and different cultural heritages, occupying a common territory, achieve a cultural solidarity sufficient at least to sustain a national existence."

A. Studies of Hispanic Intermarriage

Over the course of this century, intermarriage among members of different national-origin and religious groups has received considerable attention (Drachsler, 1921; Merton, 1941; Barron, 1946; Herberg, 1955; Bugelski, 1961; Kennedy, 1944; Thomas, 1951; Monahan, 1971; Fitzpatrick, 1966). A strong consensus exists to the effect that intermarriage is an extremely important social process with consequences for individuals, ethnic groups, and societies. A rich body of descriptive data has provided us with a reasonable picture of the extent of intermarriage for the major U.S. national-origin and religious groups. In addition, new theoretical and methodological advances have recently begun to enhance the usefulness of intermarriage data (Besanceney, 1965; Alba and Kessler, 1979; Alba, 1976; Gurak and Kritz, 1978; Shavitt, 1978; Travis, 1976; Cohen, 1972). Despite this basic consensus and the analytical advances, we still have a long way to go before we can develop a sound view of the extent, causes, and consequences of intermarriage. For example, there is no consensus on whether ethnic boundaries are in fact weakening in the United States, and we know less about intermarriage patterns in the United States for Hispanics than for European-origin ethnic groups.

This section does not intend to summarize the immense volume of research on intermarriage in the United States. Readers interested in pursuing specific points in this area will find a list of references at the back of this monograph. What follows is a summary of some major pieces of research covering several areas in the field of intermarriage and

assimilation: (1) studies which provide a national or regional overview for multiple groups; (2) studies which focus on or provide significant data concerning Hispanic populations; and (3) studies which examine the selectivity of outgroup marriage patterns. We focus primarily on studies of national-origin intermarriage because religious intermarriage is not of direct relevance to our present concern.

Despite the data limitations associated with national profiles, studies of intermarriage at the national level are extremely valuable because they provide a means of determining the extent to which local findings are representative of the general situation of a group. Two forms of data are used to describe intermarriage on both the local and the national level. Marriage records provide a description of the incidence of specific types of marriage at a specific point in time. Survey data, whether a small survey or a census, provide information on the prevalence of specific marriage patterns in a population. Incidence can tell us the rate of intermarriage among different groups at a particular time: for example, how many Puerto Ricans married non-Puerto Ricans in New York City in 1975. Prevalence gives us a cross-sectional picture of the distribution of intermarriage in a population at a particular point in time, regardless of when those marriages occurred: for example, of all married Puerto Ricans living in New York City in 1975, how many had spouses who were not Puerto Ricans.

Both forms of data are useful and both can be collected at the local and the national level. Marriage-record data, however, become increasingly difficult to collect as the number of jurisdictions increases. In the United States, the states — not the federal government — have jurisdiction over marriage licenses, and different states require different information on their marriage records. For example, a National Center for Health Statistics sample of 1970 marriage records could collect data for only 44 states. Three states — Arizona, New Mexico, and Oklahoma — do not have central files of marriages, and three states — Nevada, North Dakota, and South Carolina — and the District of Columbia do not record place of birth on their marriage certificates. Most states do not record place of parents' birth on certificates, so national data based on marriage records are restricted to the first generation of a subset of jurisdictions (Foley Wilson, 1977).

Most national surveys contain too few cases to permit description of more than eight or nine groups — English, Irish, Italian, German, Polish, Russian, and several collapsed categories such as Other European. The Hispanic population consists of all Hispanic groups classed together, and although these groups represent a large and growing percentage of the total population, they are smaller than the above-mentioned groups

when third and older generations are identified. Current Population Survey samples provide more cases (Carliner, 1975); however, even samples of over 100,000 households do not provide a sufficient number of cases to study intermarriage patterns of non-Mexican Hispanics in the United States. Current Population Survey data also fail to determine generation of residence. The decennial censuses do provide a sufficient number of cases to permit a detailed description of intermarriage patterns for over thirty national-origin ethnic groups (Kritz and Gurak, 1975; Gurak and Kritz, 1978); however, the lack of data on religion and on the ethnicity of third-generation Americans limits the usefulness of this information for those groups with large third- and older-generation components.[1]

Given all the above limitations on our knowledge of intermarriage patterns at the national level, what can we say about ethnic intermarriage in general and Hispanic intermarriage in particular? For the larger European ethnic groups which are adequately covered in the survey data, the evidence supports the generalization that intermarriage increases with generation of residence and with the length of time separating original large-scale immigration from the time of the data collection. For example, only 4 percent of people of English heritage marry others of English heritage; however, the corresponding rates for the Irish, Germans, Poles, and Italians are, respectively, 29, 32, 42, and 65 percent. This rank ordering corresponds closely to the recency of mass-immigration rank ordering. Within each of these groups, the highest rates of intermarriage occur among those who are second- or older-generation residents (Alba and Kessler, 1979; Abramson, 1973; and Alba, 1976).[2]

(1) The 1980 census will modify the manner in which ethnicity will be measured. The question on the place of birth of one's parents has been replaced by an item asking for ethnic identity. Own place of birth will still be asked. If the ethnic identity item proves adequate, this will permit identification of third- and older-generation individuals, although we will not be able to distinguish generation of residence beyond the first generation.

(2) Alba (1976) refers to the need to consider those with mixed parentage as a separate group. We have examined this issue with respect to the Hispanic marriage records of New York and found that it is not necessary at this time. This is essentially because the Hispanics of mixed parentage marrying in New York City in 1975 accounted for only around 4 percent of the total, with only Cubans having a rate higher than 6 percent (14 percent). The figures cited here are derived from 1963 national survey data; they consider only individuals of unmixed ethnic heritage and are, consequently, higher than those figures which define ethnicity in terms of one or the other parent.

Census data support the above conclusions, although the failure to identify the ethnic heritage of the third generation and older component produces higher rates of intermarriage (Kritz and Gurak, 1975).

Limited sample sizes and the use of inappropriate ethnic categories have restricted our knowledge of Hispanic intermarriage at the national level; nevertheless, we do have a basis for providing national norms and for noting the extent to which the Hispanic experience parallels that of other ethnic groups.

The Census Bureau estimates that 2.4 million Hispanic couples — consisting of at least one Hispanic spouse — were living in the United States in 1977. Thirty-one percent of these couples were of mixed heritage; that is, one spouse was Hispanic and the other was not (Rawlings, 1978:7). This figure uses marriage — and not the individual — as the unit of analysis. Such rates are always higher than individual rates; nevertheless, the 31-percent intermarriage rate is high when one considers that only marriages between Hispanics, regardless of national origin, and non-Hispanics are included. The rates presented in Table 1 describe the prevalence of intermarriage in 1970 using census data. These

TABLE 1
Outgroup Marriage Rates for Hispanic Males in the United States, by Generation, 1970

	Incidence[a] %	Prevalence[b] %	
	First Generation	First Generation	Second Generation
Mexican	59.0	22.4	45.8
Cuban	27.0	15.9	73.9
South American	44.7	40.9	93.3
Central American		51.5	95.7
Caribbean[c]		38.9	81.9
Puerto Rican	43.0	17.7	56.9

[a]**Source:** *Foley Wilson, 1977 (marriage records).*

The high incidence of intermarriage for Mexican-born grooms results from the failure of the marriage-record data in the NCHS sample to identify the ethnicity of U.S.-born Mexican-Americans.

[b]**Source:** *Gurak and Kritz, 1978 (census data).*

[c]*Predominantly Dominicans, but includes Jamaicans and Haitians for prevalence columns.*

rates are for individuals and they consider a marriage to be an intermarriage when the spouses are from different national-origin groups (Mexican and Cuban, for example) even if both are of Hispanic heritage. These prevalence rates exaggerate the exogamy level of Mexican-Americans since marriages with third- and older-generation Mexican-Americans are considered exogamous. The lack of significant third-generation components for the other Hispanic groups renders their rates of intermarriage reliable. Their second-generation rates are quite high in comparison with other groups, but it must be remembered that a large percentage of these outgroup marriages are with other Hispanics (Gurak and Kritz, 1978; Jaffe et al., 1976).

Marriage-record data (Foley Wilson, 1977) for the United States indicate that the incidence of intermarriage among first-generation Hispanics in 1970 was significantly higher than the prevalence rates (Table 1). This reflects a trend toward higher rates of intermarriage among the younger components of each group. Unfortunately, we do not have comparable data for the second generation; such data would be more significant since the difference between the incidence and prevalence of intermarriage among the first generation reflects, to a large degree, age at arrival. Older persons will be more likely to have married prior to immigration, while younger persons will tend to marry here. Consequently, the prevalence rates will be heavily influenced by marriages contracted outside the United States, while the incidence rates are, by definition, marriages which occurred in the United States.

Outgroup marriage among Hispanics appears to follow the patterns observed for other ethnic groups: second-generation intermarriage rates exceed those of the first generation. One exception to this parallel should be noted: more recent groups — South Americans, Central Americans, and Cubans — have higher rates of intermarriage than do older groups — Mexicans and Puerto Ricans. Regional studies (Grebler et al., 1970; Murguia and Frisbie, 1975) provide data on the Mexican-American population using marriage-record data. They support the generational pattern but find lower rates of intermarriage because of the concentration of Mexican-Americans in the Southwest, and the more thorough identification of Hispanic heritage in the records of that region. Fitzpatrick's study (1966) of the Puerto Rican population of New York City in 1949 and 1959 also supports the conclusion that marital assimilation processes for that group have been paralleling those of other U.S. ethnic groups.

One issue that has received significant attention in recent years is the selectivity of outgroup marriage. Not all outgroup marriages mean the same thing with respect to assimilation potential. For example, Hispanics

marrying outside of their national-origin group tend to marry other Hispanics. Similarly, some evidence exists that some European groups tend to have disproportionately high rates of intermarriage with other, culturally similar, European groups. The pattern of intermarriage selectivity can be thought of as reflecting the social distance which separates ethnic groups. This concept is readily accepted by social scientists, and has a long history of measurement (Bogardus, 1959, 1925; Lauman, 1973). Social distance refers to orientations members of one group have toward members of other groups. The closer two groups are to each other the greater the degree of social intimacy they will show toward each other. Clearly, intermarriage indexes the degree of social intimacy between two groups, and it has been used for that purpose (Alba, 1976; Alba and Kessler, 1979; Gurak and Kritz, 1978). Attitudes and other forms of participational activities are also highly relevant to social distance.

The social distance between two groups will result from several sources. Groups which are more similar in terms of social class, religion, general culture, and language should prove to be closer. Other factors can indirectly influence social distance. For example, the period and geographical focus of immigration can result in residential and occupational separations which increase the social distance separating two groups that are similar in the above-mentioned factors. Thus, the predominant location of Mexican-Americans in the Southwest and of Puerto Ricans in the Northeast increases the social distance between them more than would be expected in the light of their cultural similarities.

Gurak and Kritz (1978) used 1970 census data to demonstrate a pattern of outgroup marriage selectivity that persisted for second-generation groups even as the level of outgroup marriage increased dramatically. The main second-generation selectivity patterns consist of four major clusters for the 35 ethnic groups examined: Latins, Orientals, blacks, and Europeans. Among Europeans less distinct northern and eastern sub-clusters exist. Groups with high rates of intermarriage with other groups will be socially close, or clustered together, with those other groups. The 1970 census data indicate that this clustering occurs along cultural affinity lines, and that the Hispanic groups cluster together at a considerable social distance from other groups.

Alba and Kessler (1979), using data from a 1963 survey of American Catholics, argue that the selectivity of outgroup marriages has been exaggerated and that ethnic boundaries are weakening. The only evidence for selectivity consists of a disproportionately high tendency for Poles to marry other eastern Europeans, and for Irish to marry English. They employ a sophisticated procedure which controls for differences in

group size, but they analyze only eight groups because of the relatively small size of their sample.[3] Hispanics are grouped together in the "other" category. Upon reflection, their results are consistent with those of Gurak and Kritz (1978): for the groups analyzed in both studies, there is little evidence of pronounced selectivity; for Latins, Orientals, and blacks, however, outgroup marriage remains highly selective.

B. Research Design and Overview

The central purpose of this monograph is to describe the intermarriage patterns of the Hispanic ethnic groups of New York City. To accomplish this goal a research team coded the contents of all marriage records for the five boroughs of the city which described marriages in which at least one of the following conditions was present: (1) either the bride or groom was born in Puerto Rico, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Mexico, or a Spanish-speaking Central or South American country, or (2) one of the parents of the bride or the groom was born in one of the above locations.[4] This coding task was carried out at the borough halls of Manhattan, Brooklyn, the Bronx, Queens, and Staten Island during the summer of 1978 and yielded 15,955 Hispanic marriages. Follow-up visits were made during the fall and winter of 1978 in order to correct errors and clear up ambiguities.

The marriage record provides an excellent source of information on the current incidence of various forms of marriage. The place of birth of each spouse and of both parents of each spouse allows a careful specification of national origin of first- and second-generation residents of the United States. For New York City's Hispanic populations these data permit a comprehensive coverage of the groups because the recency of the immigration of all Hispanic groups to New York City (since World War II) means that essentially no significant third-generation component exists. The very small number of third-generation Hispanics consists overwhelmingly of young children. Support for these claims will be found

(3) Alba and Kessler (1979) utilize a quasi-independence model which arrives at expected rates of intermarriage independent of group size and of the rate of endogamy. This means that selectivity of the expected rates is influenced only by the pattern of outgroup marriages.

(4) Actually, 20,161 marriage records were coded including all those of Caribbean-island heritages and of Spanish heritage. We have not analyzed those data here except insofar as people from those groups were spouses of one of the five principal Hispanic groups.

in Chapters II and III when we present data on the small size of the second-generation components and their very young age structure. Consequently, we do not have the technical problems of having to use surname data, nor do we have to make assumptions about the real nature of intermarriage patterns with third-generation individuals (see Gurak and Kritz, 1978, for a discussion of such assumptions when using census data).

The marriage records contain data on age, previous marital history, type of ceremony (Catholic, Protestant, or civil), borough in which license was issued, addresses, and occupations of the bride and groom. These data, with the exception of addresses, were coded. The analysis of this information involved several sets of data transformations producing variables such as occupational status, generation of residence, ethnicity, and indicators of variables such as residential dispersion. These are discussed in subsequent chapters.

During the course of this analysis, we complain several times about the inadequacy of the data for specific purposes. Marriage records constitute official administrative documents: they were not created for the purposes of research. Consequently, they tell us very little about the social background — such as education and status of parents — of the newly married individuals. They contain no indication of attitudes or behavior patterns other than those directly related to the marital event. Nevertheless, marriage records are the best source of data currently available for monitoring interaction among Hispanics and between Hispanics and members of other groups. They do provide some background data and therefore permit some analysis of the correlates of intermarriage and the description of general characteristics of the various Hispanic national-origin groups. This last function is extremely important because we possess very little reliable empirical data on these ethnic groups in New York City. The 1970 census is out of date for such a rapidly changing population; the Current Population Surveys (U.S. Bureau of the Census, August 1978) provide up-to-date information for some groups, but do not consist of sufficient cases to provide a data profile for New York City's Hispanic populations; most other administrative data suffer from serious flaws. For example, Board of Education records fail to distinguish among the various non-Puerto Rican Hispanic groups (New York City Planning Commission, 1974). In addition to permitting a sound description of Hispanic intermarriage, the marriage-record data do provide new and useful information to augment our understanding of the social situations of those populations.

However, it must be noted that the marriage-record data are inadequate with respect to population coverage. First, individuals

residing in New York need not actually marry in New York: an unknown percentage of New York City Hispanics who married in 1975 do not appear in our data base. It is unlikely that two New York City residents would marry outside of the city although this does occur. When one spouse resides outside of the city or has family residing outside of the city, the probability of the marriage occurring outside of the city increases. A second problem in terms of population coverage consists of the growing number of couples living together without becoming legally married. This is a general tendency which has been increasing throughout U.S. society (Glick and Norton, 1977), and the tradition of consensual unions for Caribbean Hispanics may augment the tendency somewhat for the population under consideration. If, however, we can trust census data on marital status, it would appear that the marriage rate for Hispanics living in the U.S. is higher than that for the rest of the population (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1976; August 1978). In fact, the problems associated with achieving legal permanent residence status may be motivating an increase in legal marriage among Hispanics. Nevertheless, Hispanics who began living together in 1975 but who did not apply for a marriage license do not appear in our data base. This loss, of unknown magnitude, is unfortunate since our concern is with the level of interaction among members of different ethnic groups and not with the legal status of the ceremony. The unavoidable loss, however, does not greatly vitiate the usefulness of the marriage-record data.

The following chapters provide an overview of the intermarriage patterns of Hispanics who legally married in 1975 in one of the five boroughs of Greater New York. Chapter II provides a descriptive profile of each of the five Hispanic groups which the analysis focuses on: Puerto Ricans, Dominicans, Cubans, Mexicans and Central Americans,[5] and South Americans. Chapter III describes the levels of outgroup marriage which characterize these groups and the pattern of mate selectivity which exists for those Hispanics who marry outside of their groups. Chapter IV provides a descriptive profile of the occupational distributions of Hispanic brides and grooms and describes the relationship of occupational status to intermarriage for each of the five groups. Chapter V explores the relationships of several background factors to outgroup marriage in general, and outgroup marriage with third-generation Americans in

(5) In this analysis, Mexicans are combined with other Central Americans, and all mainland South American Spanish-speaking countries are considered as another distinct category. This results from the failure to code specific countries within South and Central America. Actually, there is little reason to suspect major variations within these categories (Gurak, 1978; Kritz and Gurak, 1976).

particular. While the earlier chapters introduce controls for sex and generation of residence as well as for occupation, Chapter V utilizes a more explicit multivariate framework in the attempt to maximize the descriptive power of the marriage-record data. Chapter VI provides an overview of the analysis and concludes with interpretations and recommendations concerning public policy and official data-collection procedures of relevance to the Hispanic ethnic groups of New York City.

II. HISPANIC POPULATIONS IN NEW YORK CITY

The United States is populated by a large and rapidly growing Hispanic minority. From 1970 to 1978 the Hispanic population increased from 9,072,602 to 12,046,000 (U.S. Bureau of the Census, August 1978), a growth of 32.8 percent as compared to an overall population increase for the United States of under 8 percent. The Hispanic total does not include the population of Puerto Rico, and it constitutes a significant underrepresentation of the mainland Hispanic population due to undercount problems which are related to the presence of large numbers of undocumented or illegal Hispanic immigrants in the United States (Hernandez et al., 1973). Currently, most knowledgeable estimates of the size of the illegal immigrant population range from 3.5 to 5.5 million (Keely, 1977, 1979; Robinson, 1979; Population and Development Review, 1979; U.S. House of Representatives, 1978). Should large-scale immigration continue and should Hispanics maintain their relatively high birth rate, they will surpass the black population as the United States' largest minority before 1990.

The total Hispanic population in New York City, according to 1970 census figures, amounted to 1,278,630 persons. This, like the national figure, constitutes an underestimate because it does not include the growing number of illegal immigrants residing in the city, nor does it consider the normal population growth since 1970. In addition, this figure underestimates the size of the non-Puerto Rican Hispanic component. Some estimates place the illegal immigrant population at over 1 million (*New York Times*, 1978; Economic Development Council of New York City, 1977). These estimates, however, are even more subject to unfounded speculation than those for the country as a whole because their data base is much less adequate. Nevertheless, the number of illegal immigrants is not trivial. One indicator of the size of the Hispanic community in New York City is the Board of Education estimate that 30 percent of the children in the public schools in 1977 were Hispanic (Board of Education, 1977). That 30-percent figure means there were at least 304,327 Hispanic children in New York City's schools: non-Puerto Rican Hispanics appear to be undercounted since only

Spanish surname is used to locate them whereas place of birth and parentage are used to locate Puerto Ricans. The Board of Education data also indicate an 8-percent decline in Puerto Rican enrollment between 1971 and 1977, and a 40-percent increase in the enrollment of non-Puerto Rican Hispanics for that period (Board of Education, 1979).

This increasing population is also reflected in the marriage data for New York City. Table 2 presents data on all persons marrying in the city in 1975: 22.5 percent of the individuals marrying were Hispanic; 44 percent of the Hispanics were non-Puerto Rican — this means that about 10 percent of the individuals marrying in New York City in 1975 were non-Puerto Rican Hispanics.

TABLE 2
Total Number of Persons and Total Number of Hispanic Persons Marrying in New York City, 1975

	Grooms	Brides	Total	Percent of Total NYC
TOTAL NYC	**61,531**	**61,531**	**123,062**	**100**
Puerto Rican	7,497	7,954	15,451	12.6
Dominican	1,823	1,816	3,639	3.0
Cuban	568	594	1,162	1.0
South American	2,669	2,554	5,223	4.2
Central American	1,075	1,162	2,237	1.8
TOTAL HISPANIC	**13,632**[a]	**14,080**[b]	**27,712**[c]	**22.5**

[a]*Total Hispanic grooms account for 22.2 percent of the NYC total.*

[b]*Total Hispanic brides account for 22.9 percent of the NYC total.*

[c]*The totals in this table represent the actual number of brides and grooms in each category. In subsequent tables, totals may vary slightly due to the omission of cases with missing data for particular variables.*

New York City is an especially interesting site to examine the social life of the Hispanic population because that population is not primarily Mexican as in the Southwest; nor primarily Cuban as in Miami; it is not even primarily Puerto Rican, although Puerto Ricans still appear to

constitute a majority of the city's Hispanic population. The Hispanic population of New York City includes large numbers of Dominicans, Colombians, Cubans, Ecuadorians, Mexicans, and other people from South and Central America. Unfortunately, apart from the Puerto Ricans only limited data about the size and character of Hispanic populations in the city exist. Dominicans, South Americans, and Central Americans are not specifically listed in census publications for the city. What attention has been given to the non-Puerto Rican Hispanic community has focused on estimating the magnitude of the illegal immigrant population and not on the social institutions nor on their relationships with members of other groups (but see Chaney, 1977, and Sassen-Koob, 1979). The diversity within the Hispanic population is routinely ignored by official agencies. Consequently, a secondary purpose of this monograph is to provide some basic descriptive data on New York's Hispanic populations, while we describe their basic marital assimilation pattern.

The information available on the various Hispanic populations in New York City and on the national level varies considerably. We provide both types of information but in different proportions and using different sources of data.

A. Puerto Ricans

A 1978 census report on persons of Spanish origin in the United States (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1978) listed 1,823,000 Puerto Ricans in the United States, an increase of 27.6 percent over the 1,429,000 reported in 1970. Recent estimates indicate that about 55 percent of the total Puerto Rican population on the mainland lives in New York City. This would mean about 1,002,650 Puerto Ricans living in New York City in 1978, an estimate that may be high since many observers have noted a recent increase in Puerto Rican outmigration from New York City. Nevertheless, Puerto Ricans constitute the largest Hispanic population of the city, with the most numerous concentration living in the Bronx. The Puerto Rican population in the five boroughs of New York City for 1970 is presented in Table 3.

The population of Puerto Rico is now slightly more than 3.4 million (Population Reference Bureau, 1978), meaning that close to one-third of all Puerto Ricans live on the mainland. Large-scale migration from Puerto Rico began after World War II in 1946. To a significant degree, the migration is economic in character and was set off by rapid population increases, high unemployment rates, and widespread poverty. Migration was also facilitated by the existence of unrestricted movement between

TABLE 3
Puerto Rican Population
in New York City, by Borough, 1970

Borough	Number	Percent of NYC Puerto Rican Population
Bronx	316,772	39.0
Brooklyn	271,769	33.5
Manhattan	185,323	22.8
Queens	33,141	4.1
Staten Island	4,838	0.6
Total	**811,843**	**100.00**

Source: *U.S. Bureau of the Census (1973): Tables 34 and 129 for New York State.*

Puerto Rico and the United States, the availability of cheap air transportation, and the large population of Puerto Ricans already in New York (70,000 in 1940), who could provide assistance to the newcomers.

Since Puerto Ricans are U.S. citizens, movement between the island and the mainland is part of the internal migration of the United States. This fact distinguishes the situation of Puerto Ricans significantly from that of other Hispanics in the U.S. who are subject to immigration restrictions. Traffic between the island and the mainland is thus very heavy. In 1974, for example, 1,661,001 persons travelled from Puerto Rico to the mainland, and 1,630,525 persons travelled from the mainland to Puerto Rico (Puerto Rico Planning Board, 1975). More persons have been returning to the island in recent years than coming to the mainland, but there is no way of accurately identifying how many there are in each group. The best indication of movement is the transfer of public school children from mainland schools to Puerto Rican schools and vice versa. In the 1974-75 school year, for example, 8,547 children transferred from public schools in Puerto Rico to public schools in New York City; 9,254 children transferred from New York City schools to schools in Puerto Rico (Board of Education, 1979). Second-generation Puerto Ricans — those born in the United States of Puerto Rican parentage — continue to increase in number, from 75,000 in 1950 to 580,000 in 1970 (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1973).

Although Puerto Ricans are U.S. citizens, they possess a language and culture which are distinct from that of the mainland. As a result, their experience in U.S. cities is similar to that of immigrants from other Spanish-speaking areas. As a group, Puerto Ricans are the poorest

Hispanics in the United States. Their median family income in 1978 was reported as $7,972, more than $3,000 below that of the Mexicans, the next poorest Hispanic group. In the same year 38.8 percent of all Puerto Rican families were below the poverty level (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1978). Poverty results from high levels of unemployment: 11.5 percent in 1978 (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1978). It is also related to high rates of female-headed families: 28 percent of all Puerto Rican families in 1970. Fifty-eight percent of these female-headed families had a median family income below the poverty level (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1973).

Poverty is also related to low educational levels. In New York City, a disproportionate number of Puerto Ricans lack the educational background necessary for white-collar work. In 1970, Puerto Ricans 25 years of age and older had completed a median of 8.4 years of schooling, in contrast to 12.1 years for the total U.S. population over 25. For second-generation Puerto Ricans the median years of schooling completed increased to 11.5, close to the 12.5 years for the total population (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1973). The improvement in schooling is reflected in a shift to white-collar occupations for the second generation. In 1970, 41.8 percent of second-generation Puerto Rican men employed were in white-collar occupations in contrast to 24.8 percent of the first generation. For employed Puerto Rican women the increase is greater: from 29.4 percent of the first generation to 76.6 percent of the second generation (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1973). However, this advance in the occupational level has not yet made its influence felt in regard to the general situation of Puerto Ricans since the percentage of second-generation Puerto Ricans in the labor force is too small, namely 13 percent of employed Puerto Rican men in 1970 (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1973).

The Puerto Rican population is very young. Nationwide, the median age of Puerto Ricans in 1976 was 20.4 years, in contrast to 29.2 years for the total U.S. population (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1978). This becomes more evident if the second generation alone is considered: the median age of second-generation Puerto Ricans — who accounted for 42 percent of the Puerto Rican population in 1970 — was 9.3 years. In New York State it was 9.6 years (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1973). In New York City in 1970, 73 percent of second-generation Puerto Ricans were under 15 years of age. This age structure results from the recency of Puerto Rican migration to New York. There is, thus, no significant third-generation component among Puerto Ricans in New York City.

Puerto Ricans range in color from completely caucasoid to completely negroid with all variations in between. They are the first mass immigration to come to the U.S. from a background of widespread

intermingling and intermarriage of persons of different color. There is a consciousness of color in Puerto Rico, but it is quite distinct from the consciousness of color in the United States (Ginorio, 1979). It is not clear whether this affects the patterns of intermarriage on the mainland, whether black will tend to marry black and white to marry white. A study by Fitzpatrick (1966) found that about 25 percent of a selected sample of Puerto Rican marriages were between persons who in the United States would have been identified as of different color.

The great majority of Puerto Ricans are baptized Catholics (Fitzpatrick, 1971). Various Protestant denominational churches are found all over the Island, but Pentecostal sects have been the most aggressive religious groups for many years. Catholic marriage ceremonies in Puerto Rico have declined from 61 percent of all marriages in 1949 to 31 percent in 1975. Protestant ceremonies have nearly doubled in that time, from 14 percent in 1949 to 25 percent in 1975. Civil ceremonies, on the other hand, have increased from 24 percent of all ceremonies in 1949 to 44 percent in 1975. These rates vary greatly from one part of the island to another and may be related to increasing rates of divorce. In 1975 there were 12,985 divorces in Puerto Rico, a ratio of one divorce to every 2.5 marriages. Eleven percent of the men and 21 percent of the women marrying in Puerto Rico in 1975 were divorced persons entering another marriage (Departamento de Salud, 1975).

All the data available up to the time of this study indicate that assimilation on the basis of intermarriage has been following a pattern very similar to that of previous immigrants to the United States. The prevalence of outgroup marriage in 1970 was much higher for second-generation Puerto Ricans than for the first generation. For first-generation Puerto Rican men and women, married and living with their spouses, 17.7 percent were living with a non-Puerto Rican spouse; this rate increased in the second generation to 56.7 percent (Gurak and Kritz, 1978). This increase in outgroup marriages for the second generation parallels those found for other ethnic groups (Drachsler, 1921; Alba, 1976; Abramson, 1974). Fitzpatrick (1966) found a similar increase from first to second generation in the incidence of outgroup marriages among Puerto Ricans in New York City in 1949 and 1959.

B. Dominicans

Persons from the Dominican Republic are recent arrivals to the United States and to New York City. The U.S. Census reported 11,900 Dominicans in the United States in 1960, a figure which had grown to

61,200 in 1970. In 1973, the Department of Justice estimated there were 81,875 Dominicans legally residing in the United States (U.S. Department of Justice, 1973). The annual registration of aliens in the U.S. shows that the largest percentage of Dominicans (63.2 percent in 1973) reside in New York State. If the 63.2 percent registered in New York State as legal aliens is used as a reasonable basis for determining the location of the total population, there would have been 51,580 Dominicans in New York State in 1973, the great majority in New York City. Of these, 95 percent were born in the Dominican Republic, 5 percent were second generation or born in the United States of Dominican parents. This is reflected in the number of persons marrying in New York City in 1975: out of 3,639 Dominicans who married, only 96 were second generation.

However, in calculating the size of the Dominican population in the U.S. there is an unknown factor which must be taken into consideration: the large number of undocumented or illegal immigrants who live in the U.S., particularly New York City. No one knows how many there are, but estimates indicate that the number is very high. Ugalde et al. (1979) estimate that 300,000 Dominicans were permanent residents in the United States in 1978. They based their figures on an estimate of the U.S. Consulate in Santo Domingo that in 1969 there were 185,000 Dominicans living in the U.S., a figure that is almost three times the number reported by the U.S. Census of 1970. Ugalde et al. then added to this figure an average annual migration of 12,600 for the years 1969 to 1978, and thus arrived at their final figure of 300,000.[6] According to this estimate and the above estimates of the number residing in New York, there would then be 190,000 Dominicans in New York State, the overwhelming majority in New York City. With reference to data based on marriage records, it is important to note that an alien is not required to show proof of legal residence in the United States to obtain a marriage license. Consequently, in the marriage data the partners may be either legal or illegal aliens.

The Dominican Republic had a population of 5.1 million in 1978

---

(6) Ugalde and his co-authors correctly consider this to be a conservative estimate and an approximate one. The 1969 estimate is probably high since it ignores the two-way flow of all migration, but the annual migration figures are low, being based on legal immigration. The truth is that there are no sound estimates of the illegal population. However, the total Dominican population in the U.S. is almost certainly several times larger than any official counts indicate. See also Dominguez (1975: 36) for a discussion of estimation problems.

(Population Reference Bureau, 1978). The great majority of the people are baptized Catholics and are racially similar to the population of Puerto Rico, ranging from completely caucasoid to completely negroid. The Dominican Republic is a poor agricultural nation. Life expectancy in 1978 was 58 years and the literacy rate was 64 percent, with the government spending only $13 per capita for education (Overseas Development Council, 1977). Nevertheless Ugalde et al. (1979) present evidence from a 1974 national health study in the Dominican Republic (DIAGNOS)[7] that the persons migrating to the United States are of generally high status. According to the DIAGNOS data, 60 percent of the immigrants coming to the United States were from the middle and upper classes. The occupational levels reported in the DIAGNOS study tend to be high; this is confirmed by the occupational levels of Dominican immigrants as reported by the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service for 1975. In both reports 20 percent of the migrants were white-collar level and above. The level of literacy in families of migrants (61 percent) was much higher than that of the families of non-migrants (37 percent). A substantial number (18 percent) were migrating to study. Most (60 percent) were coming to seek employment or higher incomes.

The occupational levels of Dominicans marrying in New York in 1975 are presented in Table 4. A considerable percentage are in high- or middle-level occupations; however, slightly more than half the men and women are in low levels of occupation. In the process of migration, persons from high occupational levels in the country of origin may find it necessary to start at low levels in the country to which they migrate; this downward mobility produces a lower average occupational status for data collected in the United States.

The Dominican population is very young because of its high birth rate — 39/1000 in 1978 (Population Reference Bureau, 1978). The rate of population increase was 3.0 percent in 1978, one of the highest in the world, though it has been declining in the 1970s. In terms of population pressure, the potential for migration is high. At the same time, Dominicans face restrictions on migration to the United States. In 1965 the U.S. established a ceiling of 120,000 entry visas to the U.S. for all of the Western Hemisphere; since January 1977, a 20,000 ceiling for

(7) Respondents in the Diagnos Survey indicated whether any household members were currently living abroad. This question permits comparison of families who are part of an international migration network with those which are not. The Diagnos results have been confirmed by a 1978 survey in the Dominican Republic (Gurak et al., 1979).

TABLE 4
Occupational Level of Dominican Grooms and Brides, New York City, 1975

Occupational Level	Grooms	Brides
High	7.7	2.7
Medium	30.1	16.6
Low	55.2	43.3
Out of the labor force	7.0	37.4
Number of cases	1823 (100%)	1816 (100%)

Source: *New York City marriage records, 1975.*

Note: High = professional or managerial.
Medium = sales, clerical, foremen and craftsmen.
Low = service workers, operatives, and laborers.

individual nations has been in force. The Dominican Republic has never had an annual number of immigrants with permanent residency visas approaching the 20,000 mark. Should population pressure build up, immigration restrictions would act as a check on migration. At the same time, pressure to migrate without documents would increase.

Hendricks (1974) provides one of the few discussions of the Dominican community and Dominican marriages in New York City in his study of rural migrants in New York (see also: Kayal, 1978; Sassen-Koob, 1979). This is a study of a small village in the Cibao Valley of the northern Dominican Republic — Sabana Iglesias — and of the residents of this village who had come to New York City. Persons migrating from this village constituted the poorer segments of the island's population; consequently, one would not expect the characteristics of these people to represent those generally found in the Dominican community in New York City.

Hendricks describes the three patterns of marriage common among Dominicans on the Island: Catholic marriages, civil marriages, and free or consensual unions. In rural areas similar to Sabana Iglesias, free unions are most common; Catholic marriages are rare, either because they are more expensive, both for the ceremony and for the subsequent fiesta, or because the couple is hesitant to bind themselves in what is formally declared by the Church to be an indissoluble union. In the transition to the United States, civil marriages become much more common, often as a

matter of convenience in dealing with the details of immigration to the United States. This has become particularly important in recent years with the increase in the number of Dominicans who are illegal residents. Marriage to an American citizen is a straightforward way of regularizing one's status. In the sample of 118 marriage unions reported by Hendricks for the villagers he studied in New York City, only 4 percent were outgroup marriages; the rest were with Dominicans, the largest number with kinsmen. This is very different from the marriage data reported in the present study for all Dominicans in New York City.

Since we know so little about the Dominican population, especially about the very small second generation, we must rely on marriage records as the best indicator we have to date about the process of Dominican assimilation. Marriage status for all Dominicans in the United States according to the U.S. Census of 1970 is presented in Table 5. The small percentage of married persons in the second generation reflects the young age distribution of these persons, a situation similar to that of the second-generation Puerto Rican population for whom the median age (9.7 years) is clearly known. The percentage of persons with absent spouses and persons who were separated or divorced for the second-generation Dominicans is 16.7 percent, a rate below the U.S. national average (Rawlings, 1978). The rate of "never married" among the first-generation Dominicans (30 percent) appears high, but it is close to the 1975 national average of 26.1 percent (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1976). Nevertheless, the sex ratio of Dominicans—77.8 men per 100 women — indicates that the impact of immigration on marriage patterns must be significant.

TABLE 5
Civil Status of All Dominicans in the United States, 14 Years Old and Over, by Generation, 1970

Civil Status	First Generation	Second Generation
Married spouse present	45.0	18.5
Married spouse absent	5.3	7.4
Widowed	5.3	1.9
Divorced	7.3	3.7
Separated	7.1	3.7
Never married	30.1	64.8
TOTAL	**100.1%**	**100.0%**

Source: *5 and 15% Neighborhood Census Public Use Samples; see U.S. Bureau of the Census (1972) for details.*

C. Cubans

The Cuban population of the United States has come largely since 1959 as refugees from the revolution of Fidel Castro. The revolutionary government inaugurated a series of political and economic reforms which motivated many of the middle and upper class to flee the island. Their flight and resettlement in the United States were aided by the U.S. Government. Although they faced the task of starting life over again in a new country, they have demonstrated a great capacity for taking advantage of opportunities in the United States for social and economic advancement.

The U.S. census estimated 689,000 Cubans in the United States in 1978, an increase of 26.5 percent over the 544,600 counted in 1970 (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1978). They are heavily concentrated in Florida — particularly Miami where more than 50 percent of the Cuban population in the U.S. reside — in northern New Jersey and New York. About 80 percent of the Cubans were born in Cuba; 20 percent were born in the U.S. of Cuban parentage. In 1970 the Census reported 87,179 Cubans — 15.5 percent of the total Cuban population in the U.S. — in New York City (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1973). If that percentage still holds for the 1978 population, there would have been about 107,000 Cubans in New York City in that year. When the Cuban population of New York State is distinguished from that of Florida, New Jersey, and all other states some significant differences emerge. New York State has a much larger percentage of Cubans born in the United States (23 percent) than Florida (16 percent) or New Jersey (14 percent) which indicates that the Cuban population before the large-scale emigration may have been concentrated in New York City.

Cuban-Americans are predominantly caucasoid and Catholic. They are decidedly a middle-class population with middle-class family characteristics. They are an adult population, with a median age in 1978 of 36.5 years, more than 7 years higher than that of the total population of the U.S. (29.2), and much higher than the median age of Mexicans (21.3) or Puerto Ricans (20.3). Their educational level is much higher than that of Mexicans and Puerto Ricans; of Cubans over 25 years of age, 49.1 percent had finished high school, in contrast to 34.3 percent of Mexicans and 36.0 percent of Puerto Ricans. Family size is smaller than that of Mexicans or Puerto Ricans, and resembles that of the total U.S. The mean number of children born to Cuban women, aged 35 to 45, in 1970 was 2.06, smaller than the 3.08 for non-foreign stock white women, and much smaller than that for Mexicans, 4.49, or Puerto Ricans, 3.42 (Kritz and Gurak, 1976; Gurak, 1978). Also the percentage of families

with five persons or more is smaller for Cubans (14.3 percent) than for Mexicans (36.9 percent) or Puerto Ricans (26.3 percent) and closer to that of the total U.S. (19.3 percent) (Jaffe et al., 1976). Their median family income in 1978 was $14,182 in contrast to $11,742 for Mexicans, $7,972 for Puerto Ricans, and $12,500 for other Hispanics. Although the occupational status of Cubans has declined in their exile from Cuba to the United States (Rogg, 1974), their occupations are at the highest level of all the Hispanics groups; in fact, they are almost as high as that for the total United States. Forty-two percent of the U.S. males 16 years of age or older had white-collar occupations. The corresponding rate for Cuban men was 39.7 percent, and 24.1 percent for all Hispanic males (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1978; see also: Wilber et al., 1975).

The Island of Cuba had a population of 9.7 million in 1978. It has a moderately low birth rate of 21/1000 and a population increase of 1.5 percent per year (Population Reference Bureau, 1978). It is in the process of stabilizing the revolution inaugurated by Fidel Castro in 1959 and of establishing a socialist society. Life expectancy at 70 years is high; literacy is 78 percent; and, in 1972, Cuba spent $31 per capita for education, a figure which has increased considerably since then (Overseas Development Council, 1977). Migration out of Cuba is restricted and it is not clear whether it will continue in the near future. Diplomatic and trade relations between the United States and Cuba are suspended.

An extensive analysis of Cuban intermarriage on the basis of 1970 Census data is presented by Jaffe et al. (1976). Table 6 presents data on Cuban women who were married to non-Cuban husbands. The intermarriage rate for New York (26 percent) exceeds that of all other areas.

TABLE 6
Percentage of All Women of Cuban Origin[a] Married to Non-Cubans, in Selected Locales, 1970

Locale	Percentage
United States	17
Florida	13
New Jersey	10
New York	26
All other states	23

Source: *Jaffe et al. (1976): Table 81, p. 300.*

[a]*All women of Cuban origin include women born in the U.S. of Cuban parentage or ancestry.*

Since there is a presumption that a higher percentage of Cubans in New York were here before 1959, it is likely that a higher percentage of second-generation Cubans are represented in the above figure. Since outmarriage is higher among second-generation persons in general, this may explain the higher percentage of Cuban women in New York, married to non-Cubans. In addition, the density of the Cuban population is lower in New York than in Miami or New Jersey. The low rate of outmarriage in Florida (13 percent) and the relatively high rate in all other states (23 percent) apparently reflects the density of the Cuban population in Florida, and the dispersal of Cubans in non-Cuban populations in states other than Florida, New York, and New Jersey. Since Cubans in New Jersey are heavily concentrated in West New York (the densest concentration outside of Miami), Union City, and Elizabeth, this may explain the low rate of outmarriage in New Jersey. It may also reflect a relatively low percentage of second-generation Cubans. The relationship of the density of an ethnic group and the probability of outmarriage is examined in Chapter V.

On the basis of a Census Public Use Sample of the Hispanic population, Jaffe et al. (1976) were able to obtain more detailed information about Cuban marriages. For all U.S.-born married women of Cuban descent in 1970, 54 percent were married to Cuban or Hispanic husbands, and 46 percent were married to non-Hispanics. Education becomes a significant variable here: those who finished high school had a rate of outmarriage of 51 percent to non-Hispanics whereas of those who had less than high school education only 37 percent were married to non-Hispanics.

On the basis of all indicators, Cubans appear to be assimilating rapidly. Intermarriage rates are very high, fertility is very low and similar to that of the total U.S. population. Occupational and educational levels also resemble those of the total U.S. population. As a result, the high rates of intermarriage revealed by the present study simply add another body of data to confirm what is evident from other sources; namely, that Cubans are rapidly becoming part of the mainstream of American society.

D. South and Central Americans

This analysis of Hispanic marriages in New York City focuses on two additional Hispanic categories: South Americans — people born in Spanish-speaking countries in the continent of South America or of such parentage; and Central Americans — people born in a Central American country or in Mexico or of such parentage. Mexicans are included in the Central American group because of their small numbers in New York

City. Because of the recent arrival of these groups, very little information exists on them. For the purposes of this overview we describe one aggregated group: the other Latin Americans.

Published census reports provide no data on Central and South Americans in New York City. In addition, their numbers are too small to provide adequate samples for the city from Public Use Samples of the Census or Current Population Surveys. Consequently, our background description of these groups relies on national data. While Mexican-Americans are classified separately in some census reports for New York City, that population represents a very small proportion of New York's total Hispanic population: 7,893 individuals in 1970 (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1973). Considerable information on Mexican-Americans exists for the U.S. but we do not focus on it here for two reasons: (1) the small New York Mexican population probably differs from the national profile significantly; and (2) this analysis does not examine Mexican intermarriage apart from intermarriages of Central Americans.[8]

In 1978, the Census Bureau reported 863,000 Central or South Americans in the United States (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1978). This represents an increase of approximately 66 percent over the number reported in the 1970 census. In 1970, 65 percent of the combined figure were persons from South America. If that percentage still prevails, approximately 561,000 persons of South American origin, and 302,000 persons of Central American origin, would have lived in the United States in 1978. The South Americans are the newest Hispanic immigrants, and they are increasing at a very fast rate. Of Central and South American persons reported in the 1970 Census, 69 percent had migrated to the United States between 1960 and 1969. The largest number of this group has come from Colombia — 84,000 in 1970 (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1973). However, large numbers have also come from Ecuador, Peru, Chile, Argentina, and several Central American countries. More than two-thirds of Central and South Americans are foreign born, and the majority of the second generation is under 15 years of age. Perhaps as many as one-third of this category live in the New York metropolitan area.

For the most part the migration of Central and South Americans is economically motivated; many are in the United States without documents and hope to return to their countries of origin. They are Catholic and of varied racial background, including Indian stock from Andean or Central American countries and European stock from Chile or

(8) Throughout the remainder of this monograph, Mexicans are categorized with Central Americans.

Argentina. Many of them are highly skilled professionals; others are unskilled workers. Significant numbers of these migrants are in the country illegally.

Few studies on Central and South Americans in New York City exist. A limited number of publications provide us with data on parts or all of the South and Central American categories. Cruz and Castaño (1976) and Chaney (1976) give data on the Colombian immigration stream. Jaffe et al. (1976) do so for all South and Central Americans. The Census Bureau also provides some data from the Current Population Surveys, though most of their tables combine South and Central Americans along with all other Hispanics (including Spaniards and Dominicans).

In general their educational and occupational levels tend to approximate those of the total U.S. population, and are substantially above those of most other Hispanic groups in the United States. However, as Jaffe et al. (1976) point out, there are regional variations. Educational levels in the New York area are lower than those in other sectors of the nation. The median age of the South and Central Americans in 1977 was 26.8 years, considerably higher than that of Puerto Ricans and Dominicans, but considerably lower than that of Cubans (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1978). The small percentage of second-generation persons of marriageable age is evident from the New York City marriage data: out of 5,223 South Americans marrying in 1975, only 134 were second generation; of 2,237 Central Americans marrying, only 143 were second generation.

Chaney (1977) and Sassen-Koob (1979) have provided some details of the social and economic life of Colombians in New York City. Their reports, based on personal contacts and data on organizations, do not permit construction of a population profile, but they do provide some clues. First, the Colombian population resides in Queens to a great extent. Second, there exists much evidence of the importance of instrumental organizations. Sassen-Koob (1979) found that while Dominicans in the Washington Heights section of Manhattan were more likely to belong to organizations, those organizations were overwhelmingly social or expressive. Colombian organizations were, on the other hand, overwhelmingly instrumental — dealing with business, political, and legal issues.

The nations from which the South and Central Americans come vary substantially. El Salvador and Honduras in Central America, for example, are listed by the United Nations as "Fourth World" nations, the poorest of the poor. Venezuela is listed among the OPEC nations; all the others are listed as "Third World" nations; not one is listed among the nations of the developed world. Taken together, Hispanic America (including

Central and South America and Mexico) has a large and rapidly growing population — 314 million in 1978 and a 2.8 percent rate of natural increase (Population Reference Bureau, 1978). Given this rapid growth and the poverty of many of these nations, the pressure for continued migration will be great.

It appears that the persons coming to the United States have middle-class characteristics. This would lead us to expect a pattern of rapid assimilation, a pattern which is evident in the high rates of outgroup marriage in New York City in 1975.

The ceiling of 120,000 visas per year which was established with the expectation that it would conveniently provide for Western Hemisphere migration, is already proving restrictive in terms of the large numbers who are seeking to migrate.[9] We can expect a continued increase in the number of Hispanic immigrants in the United States — both documented and undocumented.

E. Summary

Several aspects of the overview provided by this chapter deserve emphasis because of their bearing on the present study. Even a cursory review such as this demonstrates the significant degree of diversity among Hispanic ethnic groups. Major differences in points of origin exist: with immigrants from the Caribbean, Central American, and Andean social and economic systems. The typical form of migration also differs markedly: Puerto Ricans are internal migrants, Cubans are political refugees, and others must face and overcome the restrictions of U.S. immigration policy. For those groups subject to normal immigration regulations, illegal immigration represents a common status. The social characteristics of the Hispanics living in the Untied States also indicate diversity: regional settlement patterns and socioeconomic status vary significantly among groups (see also: Wilber and Hagan, 1975).

The population overviews are constricted by the scarcity of appropriate data. In fact, an important contribution of this monograph is its

(9) Estimates of population trends for the U.S. as a whole can be gained from examining the immigrant visa data contained in the annual reports of the Immigration and the Naturalization Service (U.S. Department of Justice, 1976). The absolute numbers tell us little since they do not include data on return migration, illegal entries, or visa abusers. Nevertheless, legal and illegal immigration streams are probably strongly correlated (see Kritz, 1979 a, b; Kritz and Gurak, 1979; Reichert and Massey, 1979).

presentation of a new set of data to fill in our still fragmented picture of the social condition of Hispanic populations in the United States. The limited data results for several reasons: (1) Census data for 1970 provide only an out-of-date point of reference for a rapidly growing population. (2) Census and Current Population Survey data do not adequately cover several Hispanic populations within small regions such as New York City. (3) The existence of a large population of illegal or undocumented immigrants which makes population coverage by any data source suspect to some degree. The 1980 census, with its revised measurement of ethnicity on the basic census questionnaire, should remedy the first two problems. The third, however, represents an inherent limit to the completeness of our description of Hispanic populations.

Despite these limitations, the profiles presented in this chapter do establish the diversity of the social and economic conditions of Hispanic ethnic groups in the United States. The data presented in the following chapters demonstrate this diversity for the intermarriage patterns of Hispanic groups in New York City.

III. HISPANIC INTERMARRIAGE PATTERNS IN NEW YORK CITY

The past two decades have witnessed a dramatic increase in the absolute and relative size of New York City's Hispanic population, particularly the growth of the non-Puerto Rican sector of this population. The 15,955 New York marriages which involved at least one Hispanic spouse represented 25.9 percent of all marriages in the city in 1975. Of the Hispanic marriages 63 percent involved at least one Puerto Rican, while the remaining 37 percent involved only other Hispanics. From the point of view of individuals, the 27,712 Hispanics who married in 1975 represented 22.5 percent of all the individuals who married in the city that year. Of the Hispanics 55.8 percent were Puerto Ricans, 18.8 percent were South Americans, 13.1 percent were Dominicans, 8.1 percent were Mexicans or Central Americans, and 4.2 percent were Cubans.

The formidable size of the non-Puerto Rican segment of the Hispanic population adds a new dimension to the analysis of Hispanic intermarriage. The social environment of young Puerto Ricans in 1975 differed from that of earlier generations in several important respects: the Puerto Rican community was larger in 1975; its institutions were better established; a large Puerto Rican second generation had emerged; and the Hispanic environment had been modified by the introduction of other Spanish-speaking populations. Conversely, the youth of non-Puerto Rican Hispanic ethnic groups faced a situation markedly different from that faced by Puerto Ricans during an earlier stage of their migration to New York City. The non-Puerto Rican youth today live in an environment which, although dominated by other ethnic groups, is much more pervasively Hispanic than that faced by Puerto Rican youths twenty to thirty years earlier.

This chapter describes the basic outlines of Hispanic intermarriage in New York City. The bulk of the analysis focuses on the diversity which characterizes the Hispanic marital experience. Indeed, the futility of lumping Hispanics into one group even for basic descriptions becomes apparent with only a cursory glance at the findings.

The key questions posed in this chapter are: (1) What percentage of brides and grooms marry outside of their national origin group? (2) What

pattern of intermarriage exists among individuals marrying exogamously? (3) What role does generation of residence play in modifying these patterns and does that role differ by ethnic group? In exploring these issues we provide a broad descriptive background of the intermarriage patterns for each Hispanic group in New York City. This descriptive base is expanded on in subsequent chapters.

Because the arrival of large numbers of non-Puerto Rican Hispanics has occurred quite recently, we lack a historical benchmark with which to compare their situation. References have been made in preceding chapters to studies of other ethnic groups, but it should be kept in mind that the situation of Hispanics differs from that of other ethnic groups in many ways. Hispanics comprise a number of distinct ethnic groups which nonetheless possess a common language and some semblance of a common culture. This means that generalizations based on the experiences of other groups may be inappropriate for reasons that go beyond the influence of the historical epoch and the economic and political conditions faced by various ethnic groups as they emigrated and adjusted to their new situations.

Nevertheless, we can provide some historical perspective for the Puerto Rican component of the 1975 marriage population. Fitzpatrick (1966) analyzed the intermarriage experience of Puerto Ricans in New York City in 1949 and 1959. These data will be compared to those for 1975 in order to determine what, if any, changes have occurred with respect to Puerto Rican intermarriage.

A. Levels of Hispanic Outgroup Marriage

The tendency for Hispanics to marry within their own national origin group varies considerably for the five Hispanic categories analyzed. Table 7 presents the exogamy rates for marriages and individuals (controlling for sex and generation). Rates for marriages are higher than rates for individuals since only one spouse need marry outside his or her group to render a marriage exogamous. The remainder of the analysis will focus on individuals rather than on marriages because of the greater interpretability of the individual unit.

While only 29.5 percent of Puerto Ricans married non-Puerto Ricans, 56.1 percent of Central Americans (including Mexicans) and 63.4 percent of Cubans married outside their groups. Only Dominicans approach the low Puerto Rican exogamy level and their rate (39.7 percent) is approximately ten percentage points higher. The low Puerto Rican rate of exogamy must be interpreted in the light of two facts which would lead

TABLE 7
Hispanic Outgroup Marriages, by Ethnic Group, Sex, and Generation, New York City, 1975[a]

	Puerto Ricans	South Americans	Dominicans	Central Americans[b]	Cubans
MARRIAGES	45.8	65.2	55.0	72.0	77.6
	(10,051)	(3,880)	(2,515)	(1,751)	(951)
INDIVIDUALS	29.5	48.4	37.9	56.1	63.4
	(15,451)	(5,223)	(3,639)	(2,237)	(1,162)
Grooms	27.3	49.5	38.0	54.3	62.5
	(7,497)	(2,669)	(1,823)	(1,075)	(568)
First Generation	27.2	48.3	37.1	51.8	56.6
	(5,054)	(2,597)	(1,784)	(1,012)	(465)
Second-generation	27.7	91.7	76.9	95.2	91.3
	(2,443)	(72)	(39)	(63)	(103)
Brides	31.5	47.2	37.7	57.7	64.1
	(7,954)	(2,554)	(1,816)	(1,162)	(594)
First Generation	32.4	46.3	36.9	55.2	57.8
	(4,707)	(2,492)	(1,779)	(1,082)	(490)
Second-generation	30.2	80.6	75.7	92.5	94.2
	(3,247)	(62)	(37)	(80)	(104)

[a]*Main figures are percentages of group specified by row and column headings. Numbers in parentheses represent number of cases used as the base in computation of percentage.*

[b]*Central American category includes Mexicans.*

one to expect a higher rate: (1) The Puerto Rican community in New York is older than other Hispanic groups. (2) Only Puerto Ricans have a large second generation. Clearly, the effects of the passage of time are mitigated by other processes. While generation is positively related to outgroup marriage for four of the Hispanic groups, it is essentially unrelated to outgroup marriage for Puerto Rican brides and grooms. In fact, second-generation Puerto Rican brides have a slightly lower probability of marrying a non-Puerto Rican than do first-generation brides (32.4 versus 30.2 percent). The second-generation outgroup marriage rates for non-Puerto Rican Hispanics range from 75.7 percent for Dominican brides to 95.2 percent for Central American grooms. As we shall see, some of the higher outgroup marriage rates of the non-Puerto Rican Hispanics are due to the relatively small size of the groups. However, the size factor does not completely account for the low Puerto Rican rates.

B. Selectivity of Intermarriage Patterns

For those Hispanics who are marrying outside of their own groups, who are they marrying? Table 8 presents a matrix of ethnicity-of-spouse percentages for the brides and grooms of each of the five Hispanic groups. The figures in the diagonal represent the ingroup or endogamy rates. Two patterns emerge clearly from this matrix: (1) The distinctiveness of ethnic patterns is more complex than can be described by merely comparing Puerto Ricans to all other Hispanics. (2) Relative group size is an important determinant of differences in outgroup marriage rates.

Puerto Rican and Dominican brides and grooms can be characterized as having high rates of in-marriage and low rates of intermarriage with third-generation Americans or other non-Hispanics. While endogamy is highest for Puerto Ricans, the rate of intermarriage with third-generation Americans is lowest for Dominicans. To a degree, any group with a high rate of endogamy will have low rates of intermarriage with specific groups; however, the intermarriage rates of Dominicans with non-Hispanics are low even when expressed as percentages of all outgroup marriages. For example, only 15.8 percent of out-marrying Dominican grooms married non-Hispanics while from 32.5 percent (South Americans) to 43.9 percent (Puerto Ricans) of out-marrying grooms of other Hispanic groups married non-Hispanics. Consequently, several patterns emerge: the ingroup tendency of Puerto Ricans; the large distance between Dominicans and non-Hispanics; and the outgroup tendency of the other groups.

Each of the non-Puerto Rican Hispanic groups has a high intermarriage

TABLE 8
Distribution of Ethnicity of Spouses for Hispanic Brides and Grooms, New York City, 1975[a]

GROOMS	BRIDES: Puerto Ricans	South Americans	Dominicans	Central Americans	Cubans	Third-generation Americans	Others	
Puerto Ricans	72.7	6.1	4.8	3.4	1.1	8.6	3.4	100%/
	68.5	17.9	19.8	22.2	13.5	—		—
South Americans	23.3	50.5	4.0	3.1	2.9	9.4	6.7	100%/
	7.8	52.8	5.8	7.2	13.1	—		—
Dominicans	24.6	3.8	62.0	2.4	1.1	3.8	2.2	100%/
	5.6	2.7	62.3	3.8	3.4	—		—
Central Americans	20.4	4.7	4.5	45.7	1.0	14.8	8.9	100%/
	2.8	2.0	2.6	42.3	1.9	—		—
Cubans	21.1	10.0	5.1	3.3	37.5	15.0	7.8	100%/
	1.5	2.2	1.6	1.6	35.9	—		—
Third-generation Americans	—	—	—	—	—			
	8.2	9.2	4.4	10.8	13.5			
Others	—	—	—	—	—			
	6.8	13.1	3.4	12.1	18.9			
	—/100%	—/100%	—/100%	—/100%	—/100%			

[a]The percentage distribution of brides' marriage choices is obtained by reading the underlined figures, organized in columns. The figures for grooms, which are not underlined, are organized in rows situated to the left of the figures for the brides. For example, 6.1 percent of Puerto Rican grooms married South American brides, and 7.8 percent of Puerto Rican brides married South American grooms. Data on third generation and "other ethnicity" are provided only when the individual is a spouse of a Hispanic; we do not have data on all marriage choices of non-Hispanics.

rate with Puerto Ricans: over 20 percent for grooms of all groups. Conversely, the rate of intermarriage of Puerto Ricans with other Hispanics is low: well under 10 percent. Much of this pattern is due to relative group size. Several analysts have documented the mathematical necessity for some version of this pattern existing. In addition, social and cultural factors, such as the relationship of group size to institutional completeness and dispersion, operate to affect the relationship between group size and exogamy.

Besanceney (1965) has pointed out that each additional intermarriage for a small group causes a larger increase in its intermarriage rate than each additional intermarriage in a large group. This is simply a function of the size of the percentage base. Similarly, while a majority group can never reach a 100-percent outgroup marriage rate, this can occur quickly for small groups. Furthermore, small groups are more subject to "forced" exogamy — that is, intermarriage induced by imbalances in the age-sex structure of a group. Various adjustments which generate expected intermarriage rates are possible (see Besanceney, 1965; Shavitt, 1978; Alba and Kessler, 1979; and Parkman and Sawyer, 1967). We will examine the effects of controlling for group size after completing the summary of basic intermarriage patterns.

For our purposes, the basic raw data provide a valuable empirical benchmark. Since we will, in subsequent chapters, be focusing on the determinants of outgroup marriage for individuals rather than for groups, this referent is valuable. While a rate for a group can be adjusted, an individual either marries out or marries within a group. Routine statistical controls are applied in the case of individuals.

Not all size differentials are due to mathematical necessity. Also important are factors such as the relationship between group size and the ability to sustain ethnic community activities on a scale that pervades much of everyday life. Thus, for many Puerto Ricans in the South Bronx it is not unusual to live in an area that is predominantly Puerto Rican; to work in a location with many other Puerto Ricans; and to shop in Puerto Rican establishments. For the smaller groups, such a life is possible but its achievement requires more of a consciously motivated effort. The probabilities dictate that members of smaller groups will interact more with outgroup members than will members of larger groups — all other things being equal.

While group size does influence the form of the data summarized in Tables 8 to 10, other factors are also clearly operative. For example, the size gradient has a major exception. Though numerically larger, South Americans have significantly higher rates of intermarriage than do

Dominicans.[10] And while we would expect Puerto Ricans, because of their large numbers, to have a lower rate of intermarriage, their very low rate appears incongruous with their high proportion of second-generation brides (41 percent) and grooms (33 percent). Contributing to the high intermarriage rates of the Cubans, South Americans, and Central Americans is their high average socioeconomic status. This point is investigated in more detail in Chapters IV and V.

Tables 9 and 10 provide a summary view of Hispanic intermarriage patterns for the complete groups and for their second-generation components. The patterns observed for the second-generation are even more subject to the size gradient because of the very small sizes of the second-generation components of the non-Puerto Rican Hispanic groups. Nevertheless, the data do reveal a pattern which differentiates Puerto Ricans from other Hispanics. The exogamy rates for non-Puerto Rican groups are extremely high, and the majority of these outgroup marriages are with non-Hispanics. For Puerto Ricans, the overall exogamy rate is essentially the same as for the first generation, and the proportion marrying third-generation Americans is lower for the second-generation.

C. Social Distances Among Ethnic Groups

To what degree is the intermarriage pattern we have described a function of group size differentials? Group size influences marriage patterns in two ways: through mathematical necessity and through its effects on social structure (the size and strength of a group's institutions). Because the second mechanism varies according to the culture of different groups and according to variations in the social situation of particular groups vis-a-vis the majority society, no single adjustment for group size can be put forth as the true solution. Nevertheless, a size adjustment should be made and we have available several alternatives which produce similar results (see: Shavitt, 1978; Besanceney, 1965; Alba and Kessler, 1974; and Parkman and Sawyer, 1967). The selectivity of outgroup marriage provides an indication of the social distance separating ethnic groups. Social distance refers to the orientations of members of one group toward members of other groups. By eliminating the influence of group

(10) It should be noted that intermarriage for members of the South and Central American categories means marriage with someone outside of those broad categories. Consequently, a marriage between a Colombian and an Ecuadorian is considered as an ingroup marriage for the purposes of this analysis; this means that the reported rates of exogamy are conservative estimates for South and Central Americans.

TABLE 9
Outgroup Marriage Choices of Hispanics, New York City, 1975[a]

	Puerto Ricans	South Americans	Dominicans	Central Americans	Cubans
BRIDES (N)	(7,954)	(2,554)	(1,816)	(1,162)	(594)
Endogamous	68.5	52.8	62.3	42.3	35.9
Exogamous	31.5	47.2	37.7	57.7	64.1
With Hispanics	16.5	24.9	29.9	34.8	31.7
With third-generation Americans	6.8	13.1	3.4	12.1	18.9
With others	8.2	9.2	4.4	10.8	13.5
GROOMS (N)	(7,497)	(2,669)	(1,823)	(1,075)	(568)
Endogamous	72.7	50.5	62.0	45.7	37.5
Exogamous	27.3	49.5	38.0	54.3	62.5
With Hispanics	15.4	33.4	32.0	30.6	39.7
With third-generation Americans	8.5	9.4	3.8	14.8	15.0
With others	3.4	6.7	2.2	8.9	7.8

[a]*Figures represent the percentages of an ethnic group which married endogamously or exogamously. The figures for endogamous and total exogamous individuals add up to 100 percent; the last three figures in each column add up to the total percent of exogamous individuals. For example, 68.5 percent of Puerto Rican brides were endogamous and 31.5 percent were exogamous. Among the exogamous Puerto Rican brides, 16.5 percent married other Hispanics, 6.8 percent married third-generation Americans, and 8.2 percent married others. The last three figures sum up to 31.5 percent, the total exogamous figure.*

TABLE 10
Distribution of Types of Marriages
of Second-Generation Hispanics, New York City, 1975[a]

	Puerto Ricans	South Americans	Dominicans	Central Americans	Cubans
BRIDES (N)	**(3,247)**	**(62)**	**(37)**	**(80)**	**(104)**
Endogamous	69.8	19.4	24.3	7.5	5.8
Exogamous	30.2	80.6	75.7	92.5	94.2
With Hispanics	12.0	27.4	43.3	28.6	34.5
With third-generation Americans	5.7	19.3	8.1	23.9	26.0
With others	12.5	33.9	24.3	40.0	33.7
GROOMS (N)	**(2,443)**	**(72)**	**(39)**	**(63)**	**(103)**
Endogamous	72.3	8.3	37.3	4.8	10.7
Exogamous	27.7	91.7	62.7	95.2	89.3
With Hispanics	19.6	39.0	26.8	46.7	40.8
With third-generation Americans	5.2	31.9	33.3	34.9	38.8
With others	2.9	20.8	2.6	13.6	9.7

[a]*See note to Table 9 for an explanation of form of this table.*

size from an intermarriage matrix, a set of measures of the social distance separating ethnic groups can be produced. The analysis that follows describes the social distances separating Hispanic groups from each other and from non-Hispanics.

Table 11 presents a social distance matrix for first- and second-generation Hispanics which was computed following the procedure of Parkman and Sawyer (1967). We use this procedure because it has a straightforward logic and because it enables us to compare Hispanic social distances with those of a large set of ethnic groups in Hawaii — a locale where intermarriage is common. The technical aspects of the Parkman-Sawyer procedure are described in note "a" of Table 11. The resulting metric — essentially a ratio of ingroup marriage to outgroup marriage — provides an indication of the social distance separating pairs of ethnic groups. The social-distance metric is based on intermarriage rates, but it is independent of the mathematical influences of group size. Each group is at zero distance from itself. Increasing scores indicate increasing social distances. The upper limit is, theoretically, infinity; but this situation occurs only when there is no intermarriage between two groups. In practice, scores greater than 50 are unusual.

The social distance scores presented in Table 11 indicate that much of the Puerto Ricans' very low exogamy rates can be attributed to the relatively large size of the group. First-generation Puerto Ricans are closer to the other Hispanic groups than those groups are to each other. The Cuban-Puerto Rican social distance constitutes a minor exception to this pattern. Perhaps of greater significance is the fact that while the social distance between Puerto Ricans and non-Hispanics is large (29), no other Hispanic group, controlling for size, is closer and both Dominicans and Cubans are more distant.

The picture changes significantly for second-generation Hispanics. The social distances separating all Hispanics from each other decline significantly. Similarly, large declines occur for all groups except Puerto Ricans in the distances separating them from non-Hispanics. Central Americans and, especially, South Americans are indexed as very close to non-Hispanics. The distances for Dominicans and Cubans are moderate, but they are 17 and 12 points, respectively, lower than in the first generation. The Puerto Rican distance (25) is only slightly greater than the Dominican score, but it has declined only 4 points. The second-generation Puerto Rican score places that group in the most distant location with respect to non-Hispanics. From these findings we can conclude that while differences in group size do exaggerate the non-assimilation pattern of Puerto Ricans, size cannot account for the relatively large social distance separating Puerto Ricans and non-

Hispanics. In brief, not only are second-generation Puerto Ricans the most distant of all Hispanics from non-Hispanics, but their decrease in social distance between generations is by far the smallest.

In order to provide a point of comparison for interpreting the social distance scores presented in Table 11, we summarize the scores found to exist in Hawaii by Parkman and Sawyer (1967). For the 1929-to-1934 period the social distances separating caucasians from each of the seven other groups ranged from 24 to 39. For 1948 to 1953, the range had decreased to 20 to 24. The unweighted average distance for all groups was 32 in the earlier period and 23 in the latter period. These scores highlight the relative closeness of New York City's Hispanics to each other (an average distance of 10.2 for the second generation). For the second generation, the distance between Hispanics and non-Hispanics also appears low in comparison with the Hawaiian situation. Of course, social distances in Hawaii may have continued declining since 1953.

D. The Puerto Rican Situation: 1949 to 1975.

What of change over time? Regardless of the situation of a group now, accurate assessment requires that we know something of where it is coming from. For the non-Puerto Rican Hispanics we must await additional information. The 1975 data could be supplemented with earlier data (1970, for example) but any attempt to construct a long-term time series would founder on the problem of insufficient cases. For the Puerto Ricans we do have data on their marriages in New York City in 1949 and 1959 (Fitzpatrick, 1966). We must rely on this information in the form that it was presented in the earlier analysis since the data file has been lost and its reconstruction would be too expensive and time consuming. Table 12 presents the 1949 and 1959 data along with Drachsler's (1921) figures for all New York City foreign-stock marriages in the 1908-to-1912 period, with the 1975 figures adjusted to render them comparable. The original Fitzpatrick study was concerned only with the marriages of Puerto Ricans to non-Hispanics. Consequently, Hispanic intermarriages were excluded from both the numerator and the denominator of the exogamy rate. While this procedure presents no problems for an analysis at one point in time, it does create biases over a period of time to the extent that the rate of intermarriage of Puerto Ricans with other Hispanics has changed. If we reasonably assume that there has been an increase of intermarriage between Puerto Ricans and other Hispanics, then it follows that the 1975 exogamy rates reported in Table 12 will be biased upwards in 1975. That is, the denominator would increase relatively more in 1975 than in earlier years with the inclusion of

TABLE 11
Social Distance Matrix by Generational Status of Groom, New York City, 1975[a]

First generation \ Second generation	Puerto Ricans	South Americans	Dominicans	Central Americans	Cubans	Non-Hispanics
Puerto Ricans	0	8	12	8	12	25
South Americans	13	0	14	6	12	4
Dominicans	15	23	0	8	10	23
Central Americans	16	22	24	0	12	11
Cubans	22	18	27	38	0	21
Non-Hispanics[b]	29	29	40	29	33	0

[a]The figures for first-generation marriages are presented below the diagonal while those for second generation are presented above the diagonal. The lower the metric number the closer the social distance between the two groups. In other words, the metric for first-generation Puerto Ricans and South Americans is 13; the metric for second-generation Puerto Ricans and South Americans is 8, indicating a much closer social distance in the second generation in contrast to the first. The metric for first-generation Dominicans and South Americans is 23; for second-generation Dominicans and South Americans, it is 14.

The social distance matrix is computed following the formula presented by Parkinson and Sawyer (1967):

$$\text{Social Distance} = 10 \cdot \text{Log}_{10}\left[\frac{\text{(Frequency within Group A) Marriage}}{\text{½ (Between A and B}} \quad \frac{\text{(Frequency within Group B) Marriage}}{+ \quad \text{Between B and A)}}\right]$$

The denominator contains two similar quantities which represent the number of grooms from Group A who married brides from Group B, and the number of grooms from Group B who married brides from Group A. The resulting metric ranges from zero (as close as possible) to infinity with increasing magnitudes indicating increasing social distance. Logs are used to keep the range of values more reasonable and establish the zero base. The metric controls for differences in group size. Consequently, it can be interpreted as the relative social distance among groups net of the constraining effects of differences in group size.

[b]*Third-generation Americans and Others are lumped together because we do not have data on intermarriage between these two groups or the total sizes for each group. This does not affect the social distance scores among Hispanic groups, but it probably produces a closer distance metric between each Hispanic group and the amalgamated non-Hispanic group than would be obtained for the Hispanic groups and third-generation Americans.*

TABLE 12
Comparison of 1975 Puerto Rican Outmarriage Rates with Those of 1959 and 1949 and with All Foreign-Stock Marriages during 1908-12, by Generation

	First Generation		Second Generation		Increase in Second Generation[b]
	%	No.	%	No.	%
Brides					
Puerto Rican 1975	12.9	3,606	20.7	2,943	7.8
Puerto Rican 1959	6.0	7,257	33.1	717	27.1
Puerto Rican 1949	8.5	3,077	30.0	523	21.5
1908-1912	10.1	61,823	30.1	14,611	20.0
Grooms					
Puerto Rican 1975	9.4	4,003	21.3	2,344	11.9
Puerto Rican 1959	3.6	7,078	27.4	638	23.8
Puerto Rican 1949	5.2	3,079	28.3	378	23.1
1908-1912	10.4	64,577	32.4	12,184	22.0

Source: *1975: New York City Marriage Records.*
1949 and 1959: Fitzpatrick (1966).
1908-12: Drachsler (1921).

[a]*Outmarriages to non-Puerto Rican Hispanics omitted for this table in order to render the 1975 data comparable to that for 1959 and 1949.*

[b]*Increase is presented as the difference between the percent in the third and first columns.*

intermarriages involving other Hispanics, while all numerators would remain the same.

Fitzpatrick (1966) reported that the 1949 and 1959 experience of Puerto Ricans in New York City had been comparable to that of the total foreign-stock population in the city from 1908 to 1912. A relatively low rate of intermarriage in the first generation is followed by increases in exogamy rates to levels near 30 percent for the second generation. In fact, the second-generation increase for Puerto Rican brides and grooms exceeded the generational differential found for the 1908-to-1912 population. These findings led to the conclusion that Puerto Ricans were assimilating in a manner related to the length of time a group had spent on the mainland. No reason to expect a distinct Puerto Rican path was uncovered.

The 1975 data do provide a reason to suspect that earlier assimilation patterns are not being replicated. While the 1975 exogamy rates for first-generation Puerto Ricans are higher than those of previous eras, those for the second generation have gone down: from 27.4 percent in 1959 to 21.3 percent in 1975 for grooms, and from 33.1 percent to 20.7 percent for brides. Similarly, the generational differential has shrunk. These findings underestimate the trend reversal because the exclusion of Hispanic intermarriages from the denominator of the exogamy rate biases those rates upward. For example, the real exogamy rate with non-Hispanics (with all marriages as the denominator) for second-generation grooms in 1975 is 8.1 percent: the upward bias has to be stronger in 1975 because of the recency of the arrival of most non-Puerto Rican Hispanics.

How can we account for this pattern? At this point only speculation is possible. It may be that the dispersion of Puerto Ricans outside of New York City has been selectively associated with assimilation. More assimilated individuals may be moving away from New York City and intermarrying. We cannot assess this possibility directly; however, we do know that the proportion of the mainland Puerto Rican population which is living outside of the metropolitan region has been growing (see Gurak and Kritz, 1975; and Jaffe et al., 1976) and that the Puerto Rican intermarriage rate is higher for the entire U.S. than for New York (see Chapter I). Cubans, South Americans, and Central Americans are far more dispersed than Puerto Ricans and have higher exogamy rates, but New York does not represent a core area for these groups to the same extent as for Puerto Ricans. For example, Miami and Hudson County in New Jersey might be expected to yield lower exogamy rates for Cubans than those found in New York City. This, indeed, proves to be the case (see Chapter II). Nevertheless, the strong reverse trend for intermarriage with non-Hispanics by second-generation Puerto Ricans must be viewed

as an indicator of at least a reduction in the rate of Puerto Rican marital assimilation. The extent to which this is a result of the special situation of Puerto Ricans in terms of their ability to retain their homeland as a center of cultural life (ease of travel and communication); or a nonvoluntary process, resulting from disadvantaged structural location and discrimination, should receive careful attention in the future.

E. Summary

Several themes emerge from this overview of Hispanic intermarriage. With the exception of Puerto Ricans and first-generation Dominicans, intermarriage rates are high for Hispanics in New York City. Especially among the second generation, many of these intermarriages involve third-generation Americans and other non-Hispanics: Puerto Ricans constitute the major exception to this theme. There is a considerable amount of intermarriage among members of the various Hispanic ethnic groups. The most common manifestation of this phenomenon consists of the high rates of intermarriage between Puerto Ricans and other Hispanics. Indeed, controlling for differences in group size, we find the social distances between Puerto Ricans and other Hispanics to be quite small.

Group size emerges as a major determinant of group differences in exogamy rates in general and intermarriage rates with non-Hispanics in particular. Controlling for group size, however, does not alter the basic conclusion that second-generation Puerto Rican marriage patterns with respect to non-Hispanics differ markedly from those of other Hispanic groups. The extension of a time series for Puerto Ricans reinforces this conclusion and indicates that previous trends toward marital assimilation of Puerto Ricans have reversed.

IV. OCCUPATION AND INTERMARRIAGE

At least some of the differences in levels and types of exogamy which distinguish New York's Hispanic ethnic groups from each other appear to be related to differences in the average socioeconomic status of the groups. In this chapter we examine the extent of those differences using the only socioeconomic indicator provided by marriage records: occupation of each spouse. Besides examining group differences in occupation, we examine occupation's relationship to exogamy and the relationship between upward mobility and exogamy noted by Fitzpatrick in his earlier (1966) study. The extent to which group differences in occupational distributions can account for differences in intermarriage rates is examined in Chapter V within a multivariate framework.

While occupation is a sound indicator of socioeconomic status, by itself it suffers from several weaknesses. Since migrants often have to work in occupations for which they were not trained, the process of migration can cause temporary downward mobility. This subsequently exaggerates generational changes and obscures behavioral correlates that are more related to unmeasured background factors than to the current occupation. Indicators of educational attainment and parental status would greatly augment the power of this analysis; unfortunately, the marriage-record data do not provide us with this sort of information. Nevertheless, occupation is a meaningful indicator of a structural location, and we suspect that to the extent that the migratory process has obscured the relationship between occupation and background, the result will be weakened rather than exaggerated conclusions. Such conservatism, as long as it does not inhibit progress, is probably a good thing.

Occupation was originally coded in ten basic census categories (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1972) plus the categories of student, housewife, and no occupation. For this analysis we have collapsed the categories both to insure sufficient cases in cells of relevant tables and to simplify the presentation of the data. The collapsed categories are described in the footnote to Table 14. The "no occupation" code deserves some additional comment, especially with regard to women. Most men will list

an occupation whether or not they are employed. While this means we do not know the employment status of the grooms, at least we do have an indictator of general social status. For a relatively large proportion of women, the tendency to list housewife if not regularly employed does provide us with data on employment status but none on social status. This point reflects a general weakness in marriage-license social background data; it becomes especially relevant for the discussion of social mobility which accompanies Table 17.

Individuals coded as having no occupation include brides and grooms who indicated their status as students. Since we possess no way of knowing the level of attainment of these persons or the school type or curriculum in which these persons are active, we cannot assign an occupational status to them. Consequently, they are grouped together with those who indicated no occupation. Because variations in the percentages of students for each ethnic group might distort the distribution of "no occupation" individuals, we present some data on the distribution of student brides and grooms in Table 13. Among the brides, Puerto Ricans, Dominicans, and Cubans have high percentages of students. While only 13.9 percent of Puerto Rican student brides were over the age of 22, from 20 percent to 34.4 percent of the student brides from the other Hispanic groups were 22 or older. This probably indicates that non-Puerto Rican brides are more likely to be in institutions of higher education. Among grooms, no significant group differences in the percentage who were students appear although Cuban grooms are most likely to be students (7.9 percent).

Removing students from the "no occupation" category does not change the relative rankings of the groups. Both Puerto Rican brides (30 percent) and grooms (2.6 percent) are most likely to have no occupation in this category when it is adjusted for student status. Lacking additional data on educational attainment, and having determined that the inclusion of students in the "no occupation" category does not bias the distribution of "no occupation" brides and grooms, we shall proceed with students included in the "no occupation" category.

A. Occupational Distributions

The occupational situation of Hispanic brides reflects differences which have been discussed in the literature (Gurak 1978; Kritz and Gurak, 1976; Cooney, 1979; Cooney and Warren, 1979; Wilber et al., 1975). Puerto Rican brides stand out due to their high percentage listing housewife or no occupation: 48.5 percent of Puerto Rican brides fall in

TABLE 13
Percent Distribution of Students for
Five Hispanic Ethnic Groups,
New York City, 1975

	Puerto Rican	South American	Dominican	Central American	Cuban
Student					
Brides	18.5	12.1	16.2	11.1	17.6
Grooms	5.9	6.4	5.8	4.5	7.9
No occupation (excluding students)					
Brides	30.0	20.4	21.2	26.2	14.0
Grooms	2.6	1.0	1.2	.8	1.6

this category (Table 14), while only 31.6 percent of Cuban brides do, with Dominicans the second highest at 37.4 percent. While there are no generational differences at this level, some do emerge in the examination of group differences in the higher status occupations.

TABLE 14
Occupation[a] of Brides by Ethnic Group and Generation, New York City, 1975

	PERCENT		
	Total	First Generation	Second Generation
Puerto Rican			
No occupation	48.5	48.3	49.0
Low	19.0	24.6	11.0
Medium	26.3	21.9	32.6
High	6.1	5.2	7.4
South American			
No occupation	32.5	32.5	32.8
Low	35.3	35.9	10.9
Medium	26.1	25.9	37.5
High	6.1	5.7	18.8
Dominican			
No occupation	37.4	37.4	37.8
Low	43.3	43.8	18.9
Medium	16.6	16.0	43.3
High	2.7	2.8	0.0
Central American			
No occupation	37.3	37.4	35.8
Low	32.9	34.3	13.6
Medium	21.9	21.1	33.3
High	7.9	7.2	17.3
Cuban			
No occupation	31.6	31.3	32.7
Low	16.0	17.3	9.6
Medium	42.5	42.4	43.3
High	9.9	9.0	14.4

[a]Occupation codes are as follows: No occupation covers students, housewives (brides), and persons not listing an occupation. Low includes operatives, laborers, farm workers, private household workers, and service

*workers. **Medium** includes sales and clerical workers, foremen, and craftsmen. **High** includes professional/technical and management/administrative workers. Each set of four percentages sums to 100 percent, allowing for rounding errors.*

TABLE 15
Occupation[a] of Grooms by Ethnic Group and Generation, New York City, 1975

	PERCENT		
	Total	First Generation	Second Generation
Puerto Rican			
No occupation	8.5	6.6	12.3
Low	51.7	55.4	44.0
Medium	30.0	28.9	32.1
High	9.8	9.1	11.6
South American			
No occupation	7.4	7.4	8.2
Low	45.9	46.5	27.4
Medium	34.2	33.9	39.7
High	12.5	12.2	24.7
Dominican			
No occupation	7.0	6.8	15.4
Low	55.2	55.4	48.7
Medium	30.1	30.4	15.4
High	7.7	7.4	20.5
Central American			
No occupation	5.3	5.4	3.1
Low	48.9	49.5	40.0
Medium	35.0	35.3	29.2
High	10.8	9.8	27.7
Cuban			
No occupation	9.5	9.0	11.7
Low	36.9	37.3	35.0
Medium	34.6	35.0	33.0
High	19.0	18.7	20.3

[a]*See note to Table 14 for occupational categories.*

In the case of Puerto Rican women 32.4 percent are listed in the two highest categories; this figure rises to 40 percent for second-generation brides. Dominicans are the most poorly represented at the top with only 19.3 percent in the top two categories; this figure rises to 43.3 percent in the second generation. Only Cubans have a higher percentage than Puerto Ricans in the top two categories for the entire group (52.4 percent), but all groups exceed the Puerto Rican representation in the second generation, with only Dominicans being close to the Puerto Rican level. The high overall level for Puerto Rican women reflects the proportionately larger size of their second-generation component.

The situation of the grooms reflects even larger differentials among groups (Table 15). There exist few differences in the percentage listing no occupation; with the only anomaly being the Central Americans' very low level. Dominican grooms have the poorest representation in the two highest categories both for the total group (37.8 percent) and for the second generation (35.9 percent). Puerto Rican grooms have the next lowest representation (39.8 percent and 43.7 percent, respectively). The other three groups are significantly better represented in the top categories in both generations, with the 53.7-percent Cuban level being the highest for the first generation; and the 64.4-percent level of South Americans, the highest for the second generation. From a slightly more restricted perspective, we find that non-Puerto Rican grooms are significantly better represented than Puerto Rican grooms in the high status (professional-managerial) category. For second-generation grooms, only 11.6 percent of Puerto Ricans are in this category, while from 20.5 percent (Dominicans) to 27.7 percent (Central Americans) of other second-generation Hispanics list professional or managerial positions. Quite clearly, group socioeconomic differences are significant.

Since the Hispanic ethnic groups of New York City differ markedly in occupational distributions, does an exogamous marriage influence occupation? Because marriage is an indicator of assimilation we expect, regardless of the ethnic group examined, that exogamous brides and grooms will have higher status occupations, reflecting their greater similarity to core society. Table 16 presents the occupational distribution of brides and grooms controlling for outgroup marriage status.

In general, exogamous individuals have higher status occupations. The relationship is strongest for Puerto Rican brides: the proportion with no occupation drops from 52.8 percent for endogamous brides to 39.5 percent for exogamous brides, while the proportion in higher status occupations (medium and high) increases from 29.1 percent to 39.5 percent. This holds for brides of the other Hispanic groups though it is consistently expressed only with more modest increases in the higher

status occupations.

Among Hispanic males, the relationship between exogamy and occupational status is weaker than for females. In four out of five cases, with South American grooms being the exception, exogamous grooms occupy higher status positions than do endogamous grooms. The differences, however, are not as striking as for brides.

While we have been treating intermarriage as a determinant of occupational status, the causal direction of the relationship must be assumed. Individuals who attain higher occupational status may encounter social situations which increase their probabilities of intermarriage. The underlying mechanisms for such a process are straightforward. Higher status occupations are positively related to educational attainment and residential mobility (Blau and Duncan, 1967). Both of these factors involve increased interaction at the primary and secondary levels with members of other ethnic groups.

Intermarriage, however, reflects more than the probabilities of meeting potential mates in a variety of social settings; it reflects, to some degree, a broad range of acculturation and assimilation processes. One does not become assimilated at the moment of outgroup marriage; rather, individuals who have become more assimilated are more likely to intermarry. More assimilated individuals may also be more likely to engage in behaviors which increase the probability of achieving higher occupational status. For example, they may be the ones who are more likely to pursue higher education or who are more willing to move if that is necessary to get a good job.

A reasonable argument can be made for occupational attainment determining intermarriage and for intermarriage, as an indicator of assimilation, determining occupational attainment. Undoubtedly, both social processes operate in reality to varying degrees. The issue cannot be resolved, however, given the limited cross-sectional data we possess. We have treated intermarriage status as an independent variable because that is the easiest way to describe differences. In Chapter V, we will explore both directions within a multivariate framework.

B. Intermarriage and Social Mobility

Fitzpatrick (1966) has argued that outmarriage for Puerto Rican women acts as a means of upward mobility. That argument has still not been well established and it is subject to ambiguities of interpretation. Are women motivated to break ethnic ties in order to improve their social status? Or does improving social status increase the probability of intermarriage?

TABLE 16
Occupation[a] of Hispanic Brides and Grooms By Outmarriage Status and Ethnicity, New York City, 1975

	Endogamous					Exogamous				
	Puerto Rican	South American	Dominican	Central American	Cuban	Puerto Rican	South American	Dominican	Central American	Cuban
Bride										
No occupation	52.8	34.8	35.6	36.9	32.9	39.5	29.9	40.2	37.5	30.9
Low	18.1	37.1	47.7	36.7	17.8	21.0	33.2	36.2	30.2	14.9
Medium	23.9	23.0	15.2	19.1	43.2	31.5	29.7	18.8	23.9	42.1
High	5.2	5.2	1.5	7.3	6.1	8.0	7.2	4.8	8.4	12.0
Totals	100% (5447)	100% (1349)	100% (1131)	100% (491)	100% (213)	100% (2531)	100% (1207)	100% (690)	100% (673)	100% (382)
Groom										
No occupation	9.3	7.0	6.4	3.9	9.9	6.3	8.0	7.9	6.5	9.3
Low	52.2	46.3	57.6	54.4	37.6	50.3	45.6	51.3	44.3	36.5
Medium	29.3	34.6	28.5	33.4	38.0	31.6	33.5	32.7	36.3	32.6
High	9.2	12.1	7.5	8.3	14.5	11.8	12.9	8.1	12.9	21.6
Totals	100% (5477)	100% (1349)	100% (1131)	100% (491)	100% (213)	100% (2073)	100% (1324)	100% (694)	100% (587)	100% (356)

[a]*See note to Table 14 for occupational categories.*

Table 17 addresses itself to these issues. For each ethnic group the occupational status of the bride is cross-classified with that of the groom twice: once for endogamous marriages and once for exogamous marriages. Table 17 provides suggestive evidence concerning the mobility hypothesis; however, several technical issues must be considered first.

A high proportion of brides have no occupation coded, and we possess no other indicator of their status. We shall not examine the mobility of women about whom we know so little. Women in the "no occupation" category may be students receiving university educations, or may come from well-to-do families, or may have completed high levels of education. To assume that they are upwardly mobile because their spouse has a job, even a low status job, would be misleading. We can, nevertheless, make some progress by examining the differences in spouses' occupations for women who list occupations: an inference can thus be made concerning whether or not a mobility pattern exists.

When reading Table 17, we should focus only on the columns representing occupations of brides (columns 2, 3, and 4 within each ethnic and intermarriage status category). For example, for Puerto Rican brides there is evidence of a mobility pattern: 34 percent of endogamous women in low status occupations married men in medium or high status occupations and 12 percent of endogamous women in medium status occupations married men in high status occupations; furthermore, 70 percent of women in high status occupations married males with lower status occupations. By way of comparison, the corresponding figure for exogamous Puerto Rican brides are 37 percent, 19 percent, and 62 percent. In summary, Puerto Rican women with listed occupations who have married exogamously are more likely to marry higher status males than are endogamous women.

This mobility pattern exists to varying degrees for all Hispanic groups. However, for South American brides it manifests itself only in the reduced tendency for exogamously married, higher status women to marry lower status males. For Cubans, the relationship is almost as weak as for South Americans; and for Central Americans the pattern emerges only for medium and high status brides. The Dominican case, on the other hand, strongly supports the mobility hypothesis. Whereas 32 percent of low-status endogamous brides and 14 percent of medium-status endogamous brides marry up; the corresponding figures for exogamous brides are 43 percent and 21 percent. In addition, while 88 percent of high-status endogamous brides marry lower status males, this is true for only 59 percent of high-status exogamous Dominican brides.

The strong upward mobility pattern for exogamous Puerto Rican and Dominican brides appears quite reasonable. These two groups are

TABLE 17
Occupational Differences[a] between Spouses by Outgroup Marriage Status and Ethnicity, New York City, 1975.

	Puerto Rican								South American							
	Endogamous				Exogamous				Endogamous				Exogamous			
Occupation of: Bride / Groom	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
1. No occupation	12	5	6	12	19	4	4	8	11	2	9	9	11	3	5	7
2. Low	54	61	45	32	52	59	37	27	45	59	32	26	36	61	36	24
3. Medium	27	28	37	27	22	28	39	27	34	32	41	29	37	23	41	24
4. High	7	6	12	30	10	9	19	38	10	7	18	37	16	13	18	44
Totals[a]	**2868**	**986**	**1302**	**286**	**995**	**532**	**797**	**201**	**468**	**500**	**310**	**70**	**360**	**401**	**359**	**86**

	Dominican								Central American							
	Endogamous				Exogamous				Endogamous				Exogamous			
Occupation of: Bride / Groom	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
1. No occupation	12	3	4	6	10	3	5	0	3	4	4	6	10	4	5	7
2. Low	53	65	50	18	51	55	38	25	61	57	43	39	48	56	37	25
3. Medium	28	27	32	65	28	35	37	34	27	36	42	31	33	32	39	25
4. High	8	5	14	12	11	8	21	41	8	3	12	25	9	8	19	43
Totals[a]	**403**	**539**	**172**	**17**	**277**	**250**	**130**	**32**	**181**	**180**	**94**	**36**	**252**	**203**	**161**	**56**

	Cuban							
	Endogamous				Exogamous			
Occupation of: Bride / Groom	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
1. No occupation	19	5	6	0	17	5	6	2
2. Low	37	53	35	15	37	53	39	24
3. Medium	36	32	42	48	35	35	36	22
4. High	9	10	16	46	11	7	19	52
Totals[a]	**70**	**38**	**92**	**13**	**117**	**57**	**161**	**46**

[a]*All figures are percents of totals at base of columns and add up to 100 percent except when rounding errors produce a slightly different sum.*

characterized by lower status occupations in comparison to the other Hispanic groups. This creates a situation in which upwardly mobile individuals are faced with a shortage of similar or higher status potential mates. Consequently, their probability of outmarriage increases. For higher status groups, women in higher occupations have reasonably large pools of higher status males to choose from within their own group. This does not mean that they are less likely to outmarry than Dominicans or Puerto Ricans; rather it means that upward mobility, *per se*, does not create pressure toward intermarriage for women in relatively high status groups.

C. Summary

Up to this point, we have fairly consistent evidence that exogamy is associated with higher occupational status, that this is more true for brides than for grooms, and that exogamous brides, who already possess higher status occupations than do endogamous brides, are more likely to marry spouses with relatively higher statuses than are their endogamous counterparts.

The Hispanic groups vary considerably in the occupational distributions of both brides and grooms. Puerto Ricans and Dominicans constitute the low status groups, while the other groups possess relatively high status distributions. The high proportion of Puerto Rican brides with no occupation stands out, a finding which is consistent with the results of studies of ethnic differentials in female labor-force participation. Cubans (especially brides) and South Americans (especially grooms) have very large proportions in the medium and high status occupational categories. Within the second generation, all groups have higher proportions in the top two categories than do Puerto Ricans. The basic conclusion on group differences in status is that Puerto Ricans and Dominicans typically have occupations of much lower status than do members of other groups. This lower status is accompanied by a stronger upward mobility pattern for the brides. Can we account for differences in exogamy rates by referring to the differences in occupational status? In Chapter V we explore this possibility and examine several other multivariate relationships.

V. INTERMARRIAGE DETERMINANTS AND CONSEQUENCES

Having described the extent and pattern of Hispanic marriage, we will now proceed to analyze the determinants and consequences of outmarriage. Although the marriage records contain only a limited pool of background data, they do permit a cursory glance at some potentially important correlates of intermarriage. In this chapter we add several variables to the set of intermarriage correlates which already include sex, generation, ethnic group, and occupation. After introducing the new variables — religion, age at marriage, number of previous marriages, and the borough where the marriage license was filed, we utilize multivariate regression procedures to determine their net effects.

The need for multivariate procedures results from the complexities of intermarriage processes. Occupational status is related to exogamy, but so is generation; and occupational distributions vary by generation. Similarly, other background variables interact with generation and exogamy. A multivariate framework can be a simple control procedure or a complex system of structural equations. Our purpose here is basic description and not causal modelling, for two primary reasons: the need for a benchmark description and the fact that the sparse background data of the marriage records greatly limit the complexity of modelling that could be attained. The regression equations presented here are not as much exercises measuring the extent to which we can explain variance in intermarriage or other factors, as they are an attempt to maximize our information on how several factors are related to intermarriage.

The following section on background variables provides descriptive data that will be of interest to most readers. It is followed by the multivariate-analysis section which utilizes regression procedures. While we have attempted to present those procedures as simply as possible, readers who are not familiar with regression may choose to skip to the summary at the end of this chapter after reading the following section.

A. Background Variables

Tables 18, 19, and 20 present distributions for background variables

which have not been utilized up to this point in the analysis. Some of these variables require explanations either because of the data restrictions or because of a need to clarify the underlying phenomenon which the variable is intended to indicate.

The marriage records do not specify the religion of either spouse, but do indicate the type of ceremony. The most common ceremony for the Hispanic groups is a civil one (51 percent); 25 percent are Protestant ceremonies and 23 percent are Catholic ceremonies. Since the type of ceremony provides only an indirect indicator of religious affiliation, we have elected not to pursue an intensive investigation of ceremony at this time. Because the dominant nominal religion for all of the Hispanic groups studied is Roman Catholicism (see Chapter II), we have created a dichotomous variable to indicate whether the ceremony was a Catholic one (coded "1") or not (coded "0"). It can reasonably be assumed that a Catholic ceremony indicates closer integration into Hispanic culture; however, the strength of this relationship is problematic, given the nominal allegiance of many Hispanics to the Church. The predominance of civil ceremonies may result from religious disaffection, from economics, or from a tendency of illegal immigrants to maintain a low profile. A civil ceremony entails less public attention than a typical church ceremony. The preference for civil ceremonies may also be a carry-over from the practice in several Latin American nations which requires a civil ceremony in addition to the religious one.

The prevalence of Catholic ceremonies varies by ethnic group, being most common for Cubans and least common for Central and South Americans (Tables 18 and 19). Puerto Rican brides and grooms are second to Cubans in the proportion having Catholic ceremonies; Catholic ceremonies increase in frequency among second-generation Hispanics, especially among South Americans and Dominicans. Only for Puerto Ricans do Protestant ceremonies constitute a significant share of the marriages: 31.6 percent of Puerto Rican brides and 31.9 percent of Puerto Rican grooms were married in Protestant ceremonies. These rates are higher than the ones given for Catholic ceremonies and they are significantly greater than the Protestant shares of the other Hispanic groups. Among second-generation brides and grooms (Table 19) we note sharp increases in the proportion of Protestant ceremonies for South and Central Americans. Religious ceremonies — Catholic and Protestant — become more common in the second generation: the increase for brides being larger than that for grooms.

Tables 18 and 19 also present data on the number of marriages and age at marriage for Hispanic brides and grooms. The proportion of the marriages which are remarriages varies from 15.6 percent for Puerto Rican

brides to 23.2 percent for Cuban brides; the corresponding figures for grooms are 13.3 percent and 31.1 percent. The second-generation remarriage rates (Table 19) are considerably lower except for Central American brides and South American grooms. These lower remarriage levels may reflect greater marital stability, but the second generation is considerably younger than the first generation; consequently, they have not had as much opportunity to divorce and remarry.

Are these remarriage rates high? If we accept national rates as a comparative referent, then the answer is clearly no. Twenty-seven percent of women and 29.1 percent of men in the United States, between the ages of 14 and 45 and who had been married, had been divorced by 1975; furthermore, 29.4 percent of divorced women and 32.8 percent of divorced men had remarried by 1975 (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1976). Of all marriages which occurred in 1975 in the United States, 28 percent of the grooms were remarrying, with the proportion of remarrying brides being only slightly lower (Glick and Norton, 1977). These figures are high and represent dramatic increases in divorce and remarriage rates. For example, as recently as 1972, only 23 percent of grooms were remarrying; whereas in 1960 the figure was 19 percent.

The Hispanic remarriage rate may appear high, but with the exception of Cuban grooms, all groups are well below the national average, and Cuban grooms are only 3.1 percentage points above the national norm. Of course, Hispanics may be experiencing high rates of marital disruption and simply may not be remarrying. We cannot determine if this is true for New York's Hispanics; however, national data indicate lower levels of divorce for Hispanics (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1976). The national figures for Hispanics are dominated by the Mexican-American population and may be inappropriate for the population being examined here.

In the United States, women marry for the first time at the average age of 20.4, and men at 22.9 (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1976). Hispanics tend to marry at older ages; however, several factors should be considered in interpreting these findings. First, age at current marriage includes remarrying individuals. Nevertheless, the ages of Hispanics who were marrying for the first time in 1975 (Table 18) were from two to six years above the national average for brides and two to four years above the national average for grooms. Second, the migratory process acts to delay marriage for the first generation. Among second-generation Hispanics marrying for the first time, the average age of marriage was essentially identical to the national norm for Dominicans and Cubans, somewhat younger than the norm for Puerto Ricans, and from two to three years older than the norm for South and Central Americans. Second-generation Hispanics in New York City tend to marry close to the national average.

TABLE 18
Background Variables by Ethnicity for all Generations, New York City, 1975[a]

	Puerto Ricans	South Amer-icans	Domin-icans	Central Amer-icans	Cubans
Type of Ceremony					
Brides:					
% Catholic	26.4	18.3	22.2	15.3	35.1
% Protestant	31.6	13.5	15.9	17.1	14.7
% Civil	41.8	66.9	61.4	65.9	47.2
Grooms:					
% Catholic	26.1	17.7	20.3	14.0	32.0
% Protestant	31.9	14.5	16.8	20.6	17.9
% Civil	41.6	66.9	62.6	64.7	48.1
Median Age at Current Marriage					
All brides	23.8	27.5	25.8	27.2	26.3
Brides marrying first time	22.5	26.2	24.0	25.9	23.6
All grooms	26.2	28.6	27.3	27.6	29.4
Grooms marrying first time	24.6	27.3	25.6	26.6	26.4
Percent Entering Second or Higher Order Marriage					
Brides	15.6	18.7	22.8	16.4	23.2
Grooms	17.3	22.6	25.2	16.8	31.1

[a]*Figures are percents of ethnic group in specific category of specific variable. Not all possible categories are listed.*

TABLE 19
Background Variables by Ethnicity
for the Second Generation, New York City, 1975[a]

	Puerto Ricans	South Amer-icans	Domin-icans	Central Amer-icans	Cubans
Type of Ceremony					
Brides:					
% Catholic	33.1	39.1	37.8	23.5	33.7
% Protestant	32.7	31.3	16.2	29.6	23.1
% Civil	33.7	25.0	45.9	43.2	33.7
Grooms:					
% Catholic	33.6	20.5	28.2	26.2	40.2
% Protestant	31.0	43.8	19.5	30.7	16.8
% Civil	35.0	34.2	48.7	36.9	42.2
Median Age at Current Marriage					
All brides	20.0	23.3	20.9	24.4	21.4
Brides marrying first time	19.7	22.2	20.5	21.6	20.8
All grooms	21.8	28.2	23.4	26.2	25.8
Grooms marrying first time	21.2	26.1	22.4	24.8	23.4
Percent Entering Second or Higher Order Marriage					
Brides	7.3	10.9	11.1	23.7	12.5
Grooms	7.4	23.3	12.8	16.9	26.7

[a]*See note to Table 18.*

Age at current marriage and remarriage status are included as background variables because both can reasonably be assumed to be related to exogamy. With increasing age, one's circle of primary contacts has more opportunity to expand; residential moves occur and job shifts take place. The passage of time also removes one, to some degree, from the influence of parents. Individuals who remarry generally choose their new spouse from a pool of potential mates who differ considerably from the selection faced at the time of the first marriage. We know that remarried women and men in the United States have spouses who differ from themselves in terms of age, religion, and educational attainment more than spouses who are in their first marriages (Dean and Gurak, 1978; Gurak and Dean, 1979). Consequently, both age and remarriage status should be related to the probability that a person will marry outside of his or her own ethnic group.

The borough in which the marriage license was obtained provides an indicator of the residence of at least one of the spouses. The borough of residence may provide an important indicator of the ethnic context in which an individual has been involved. Before expanding on this thesis, however, several caveats should be noted. First, we did not code actual residence[11] of each spouse, and even if we had, the borough provides only a very broad frame of reference. Individuals living in a borough containing a large concentration of their ethnic group may not actually be living near members of that group. Nevertheless, the probability that they will be living near members of their group is higher than in boroughs where their numbers are smaller. The lack of data on small neighborhood units means that we will miss some of the more subtle variations due to the ethnic context, but this shortcoming is unlikely to distort relationships through exaggeration.

Second, there is no obligation to obtain a marriage license in one's borough of residence. One can marry anywhere and some New York City Hispanics married in New Jersey, in Puerto Rico, or in Connecticut. Similarly, some Bronx residents obtained marriage licenses in Manhattan. Data from the 1949 and 1959 Hispanic marriage populations indicate that a very high proportion of individuals obtained licenses in their borough of residence. For example, 85 percent of grooms and 91 percent of brides whose marriage licenses were obtained in the Bronx in 1959 actually lived in the Bronx. The corresponding figures for Brooklyn were

---

(11) In the 1966 study of 1949 and 1959 marriage records, little relationship was found between health-area residence and exogamy. As a result, actual residence was not coded in 1975, a decision which later proved to be unfortunate.

TABLE 20
Distribution of Hispanic Marriages by Ethnicity and Borough, New York City, 1975.

		Bronx	Brooklyn	Manhattan	Queens	Staten Island	Totals
All Marriages	N	8,365	13,078	25,577	12,258	2,253	61,531
	%	13.6	21.2	41.6	19.9	3.7	100%
All Hispanic Marriages[a]	N	3,358	3,200	7,273	1,963	161	15,955
	%	40.0/21.0	24.5/20.1	28.4/45.6	16.0/12.3	7.1/1.0	25.9/100%
Puerto Rican	N	2,716	2,316	4,219	707	86	10,044
	%	68.4/27.0	62.2/23.0	47.4/42.0	30.9/7.0	48.3/1.0	— /100%
South American	N	424	598	1,794	1,012	49	3,877
	%	11.8/10.9	16.1/15.4	20.1/46.3	42.9/26.1	17.5/1.3	— /100%
Dominican	N	470	276	1,517	241	10	2,514
	%	3.4/18.7	7.4/11.0	17.1/60.3	10.2/9.6	5.6/.4	— /100%
Central American	N	226	427	903	170	24	1,750
	%	10.7/12.9	11.5/24.4	10.1/51.6	7.2/9.7	13.5/1.4	— /100%
Cuban	N	132	108	472	228	9	949
	%	5.7/13.9	2.9/11.4	5.3/49.7	9.7/24.0	5.1/1.0	— /100%
Totals		**3,968**	**3,725**	**8,905**	**2,358**	**178**	
		100%/ —	**100%/ —**	**100%/ —**	**100%/ —**	**100%/ —**	

[a]Because marriages involving spouses from different Hispanic groups are double counted when computing group specific totals, the sum of marriages for the five ethnic groups (lower line total) is greater than the total of Hispanic marriages (line 2). The row percentages to the right of the slashes give the distribution of marriages of specific groups across the five boroughs, i.e., 27 percent of the Puerto Rican marriages were in the Bronx; 23 percent in Brooklyn, etc. The column percentages to the left of the slashes give the distribution of Hispanic marriages within each borough, i.e., of all Hispanic marriages in the Bronx 68.4 percent were Puerto Rican, 11.8 percent were South American, etc. In line 2 "All Hispanic Marriages," the percentages to the right of the slashes present the distribution of Hispanic marriages (without double counting) by borough; the percentages to the left of the slash represent the percentage of all marriages in that borough which were Hispanic.

88 percent and 92 percent. When licenses are obtained outside the borough of residence, they are almost always obtained in Manhattan. In 1959, only 61 percent of the grooms and 64 percent of the brides who obtained licenses in Manhattan lived in Manhattan. While there may be several reasons for couples obtaining licenses in Manhattan, the most probable one is employment in that borough, which renders its municipal office a more convenient place to visit. Of course, the large number of Hispanics in Manhattan (see Table 20) increases the expected number of marriages involving one resident of Manhattan and one resident of another borough.

A third issue concerns the basics for determining the distribution of Hispanic groups across boroughs. Census data are out of date, and suffer from undercounting of Hispanics in general and of illegal immigrants in particular (Estrada et al., 1973). Other official data sources, such as school records, put all non-Puerto Rican Hispanics into one group. The marriage-license data, though far from ideal, may provide the best available indication of the residential distribution of the various Hispanic ethnic groups. Besides being an inherently up-to-date source of information, it automatically controls for age structure. This is important for a study of marital patterns since the population of concern is a relatively young one.

Table 20 presents several dimensions of information on the distribution of Hispanic groups across boroughs. The two principal items of information consist of: (1) the distribution of marriages involving members of each Hispanic group across boroughs (rows 3-7); and (2) the proportion of marriages in each borough involving a member of a specific Hispanic group (columns). These data indicate, then, the boroughs where most of each group is located and the boroughs where each group constitutes a high proportion of the Hispanic population.

The Bronx is the most Hispanic and the most Puerto Rican of the five boroughs: 40 percent of all Bronx marriages involved Hispanics and 68.4 percent of Bronx Hispanic marriages involved Puerto Ricans. This example of data contained in Table 20 illustrates our emphasis on geographical concentration rather than on absolute numbers. Manhattan was the site of the largest number of all Hispanic and all Puerto Rican marriages, but only 28.4 percent of Manhattan marriages were Hispanic, and only 47.4 percent of Hispanic marriages were Puerto Rican. While neither of these figures was small, they do not compare with the Bronx figures and they are overestimates because of the tendency of residents of other boroughs to obtain marriage licenses in Manhattan. Citywide, 63 percent of the 15,955 Hispanic marriages involved at least one Puerto Rican; 24 percent at least one South American; 16 percent at least one

Dominican; 11 percent at least one Central American; and 6 percent at least one Cuban. Puerto Ricans exceeded this mean level in the Bronx and approximately equaled it in Brooklyn. South Americans had a disproportionate share in Queens; Dominicans in Manhattan; Central Americans in essentially no borough; and Cubans in Queens.

Individuals living in social contexts in which their ethnic group predominates can reasonably be assumed to have a lower probability of outmarriage than individuals who live in an ethnically dispersed context, where the density of their ethnic group is lower. Following this logic we would expect negative relationships between exogamy and Queens residence for South Americans; between exogamy and Bronx and Brooklyn residence for Puerto Ricans; and between exogamy and Manhattan residence for Dominicans. The relatively even distributions of Cubans and Central Americans produce no expectations of this sort. With only 178 marriages involving Hispanics occurring in Staten Island, we can assume dispersion for members of all Hispanic groups who marry in that borough and, consequently, predict a positive relationship between Staten Island residence and exogamy for all groups. Zero order correlations (Table 21) conform perfectly to this pattern. The predicted negative correlations exist and are complemented by positive correlations for the other boroughs. Dispersion does appear to be a factor closely related to exogamy. Of course, the observed pattern could be a reflection of the association between residential mobility and occupational status. We will return to this point in the following regression analysis.

B. Multivariate Analysis

In Chapter III, we distinguished among various types of outgroup marriage. In particular, the distinction between all outgroup marriages and outgroup marriages with a third-generation American emerged as an important differentiator of the Hispanic groups. Third-generation American is a shorthand term for any individual who was born in the United States and whose parents were also born in the United States. It includes fourth and fifth and older generation individuals. Intermarriages involving third-generation Americans probably index assimilation better than other forms of intermarriage (for example, those involving other Hispanics or non-Hispanic foreign stock) since that group approximates what might be termed the core ethnic stock of the country. Actually, third-generation Americans consist of a rich mixture of ethnic heritages, but in New York that mixture does not include Hispanics to a significant degree. We, therefore, use two indicators of exogamy. The first dichotomous variable (ExA) is coded "1" if a marriage is with a spouse

TABLE 21
Zero Order Correlations between Exogamy and Borough of License

	Bronx	Brooklyn	Manhattan	Queens	Staten Island
Puerto Ricans					
Brides	—.09	—.07	.05	.05	.19
Grooms	—.11	—.07	.07	.18	.08
South Americans					
Brides	.01	.05	.02	—.09	.06
Grooms	.09	.08	.01	—.15	.03
Dominicans					
Brides	.04	.05	—.09	.04	.03
Grooms	.07	.11	—.13	—.01	.04
Central Americans					
Brides	—.01	—.06	.00	.09	.02
Grooms	.02	—.05	—.03	.10	.05
Cubans					
Brides	.04	.03	—.06	.01	.04
Grooms	.05	.05	—.04	—.06	.09

from any national-origin group other than the bride's or groom's own; the second dichotomous variable (ExB) is coded "1" when a spouse is a third-generation American. Separate equations are computed for each of these variables in order to examine whether the determinants and consequences of each differ.

The multivariate analysis unfolds in three stages: (1) A single equation is computed for all ethnic groups (with dichotomous variables indexing specific group membership) in order to determine whether a single equation can be used to describe relationships for all ethnic groups. (2) The determinants of exogamy for brides and grooms are examined. (3) Exogamy is treated as an independent variable in order to examine the effects of assimilation on occupational status.

Regression equations describing the net (partial) relationship of independent variables to a dependent variable can be expressed several ways. A key issue that must be discussed before proceeding is whether or not a single equation can be used for all Hispanic groups. A single equation can be used if separate equations computed for each group produce essentially the same relationships between independent and dependent variables. Fortunately, it is not necessary to compute separate equations; instead, multiplicative interaction terms can be added to an equation that contains all independent variables including N-1 ethnic-group dichotomous variables (Johnston, 1963). If the addition of the interaction terms increased the explained variance (R^2) significantly, it would be necessary to compute separate equations. This procedure was carried out and is summarized in Table 22. The separate coefficients for the 36 interaction terms (four ethnic categories times nine other independent variables) are not listed to conserve space. Their inclusion, however, does increase the explained variance significantly. This means that the coefficients reported in Table 22 represent averages of very different coefficients for each ethnic group. Consequently, the remainder of the multivariate analysis will utilize separate equations for each group.

By computing separate equations we are examining the relationship between a dependent variable, such as exogamy, and independent variables within groups, one group at a time. While this is a useful procedure, it does mean that the regression procedure cannot be used to explain the variance in exogamy which exists between groups. For example, we would like to know whether the difference in exogamy levels between Cubans and Puerto Ricans can be attributed to the higher average occupational status of Cubans. We would also like to know whether the borough-of-residence dispersion effect can account for group differences. If interactions were not significant, regressions such as those reported in Table 22 could provide answers to these questions. The

TABLE 22
Regression[a] of Exogamy on Background Factors for all Ethnic Groups: Test for Interaction

	Brides		Grooms	
Generation	.06		.08	
Occupation	.02		.02	
Bronx	—.05		—.04	
Brooklyn	—.03		—.02	
Staten Island	.28		.30	
Queens	.09		.04	
Catholic	—.07		—.10	
Dominican	.06	(.06)[b]	.12	(.10)
Cuban	.30	(.32)	.35	(.35)
Central American	.24	(.26)	.27	(.27)
South American	.11	(.15)	.21	(.22)
Previous marriage	.05		—.01	
Age	.02		.01	
Constant	.05		.11	
R_a^2	.069		.075	
R_b^2 with interactions	.093		.114	
$R_b^2 - R_a^2$	.024		.039	

[a]*Unstandardized regression coefficients are from regression without interaction terms. Final two rows present data on extent of interaction effects.*

[b]*Figures in parentheses give regresson coefficients for regression of exogamy on borough categories without other controls.*

[c]*All coefficients and differences significant at .05 level.*

answers would be no in both cases. Controlling for occupation, borough of residence, and other factors has essentially no effect on ethnic differentials. Each of the regression coefficients for the ethnic dichotomous variables can be interpreted as the difference in the proportion of outmarrying members of that group and Puerto Ricans (the excluded group). The figures in parentheses represent the regression coefficients obtained without the use of the other control variables. The

inclusion of the control variables has no significant effect on the group differentials. While the existence of interaction effects does cast some doubt on any conclusion drawn from the table, the interaction effects distort the coefficients primarily for the other control variables. Consequently, we are probably safe in concluding that while the control variables appear to be related to exogamy in interesting ways, their relationships are not powerful enough to account for the group differentials. We already know from Chapter III that much of the ethnic differential is due to differences in group size; and we must accept the conclusion that we cannot empirically specify the cause of the remainder of the differential.[12]

The remainder of this chapter presents the multivariate results for each group separately. This will provide us with a picture of how the background data we have is related to the two types of exogamy and how exogamy influences occupational status.

Tables 23 and 24 present the regressions of exogamy (ExA) and exogamy with third-generation Americans (ExB) on a set of nine independent variables. This is done separately by ethnic group and for brides (Table 23) and grooms (Table 24). All regression coefficients are unstandardized; consequently, they are expressed in the metric of the variables involved. For example, for Puerto Rican brides an increase of one occupational status score is associated with an increase of three percentage points in the level of exogamy.

Among brides, occupation is positively related to exogamy in all cases, but the magnitude of the relationship is not impressive. The largest occupation coefficient is for the prediction of ExB for South American brides (.04). This means that the difference between no occupation (1) and high occupation (4) is associated with a 16-point increase in the percentage marrying third-generation Americans. While 16 percentage points are not trivial, most coefficients are smaller than the .04 of South American brides. In general, occupational status is more strongly associated with exogamy involving third-generation Americans than with overall exogamy. This probably results from the increase in the scope of interpersonal contacts associated with higher status occupations.

The borough-of-residence coefficients appear much the same as the

(12) Actually, regression decomposition techniques can provide estimates of the contribution of group differences of independent variables to differences in dependent variables when separate equations are computed (see Gurak, 1978 and 1979, for a description of these techniques). These procedures are too complex for the basic descriptive goals of this monograph.

TABLE 23
Regression of Outgroup Marriage Indicators[a] on Background Variables for Brides of Each Ethnic Group, New York City, 1975

Independent Variables	Puerto Ricans		South Americans		Dominicans		Central Americans		Cubans	
	Dependent Variable[b]									
	ExA	ExB	ExA	ExB	ExA	ExB	ExA	ExB	ExA	ExB
Bride's occupation	.03[c]	.02[c]	.02[c]	.04[c]	.00	.02[c]	.00	.02[c]	.01	.02
Bronx	—.09[c]	—.00	.00	.00	.08[c]	.01	—.01	.01	.04	.01
Brooklyn	—.07[c]	.01	.06[c]	.04[c]	.10[c]	.04[c]	—.05	.00	.01	.10
Staten Island	.33[c]	.21[c]	.23[c]	.34[c]	.27	.18[c]	—.06	.06	.34[c]	.40[c]
Queens	.31[c]	.17[c]	—.07[c]	.04[c]	.12[c]	.04[c]	.15[c]	.13[c]	.02	.05
Catholic	—.09[c]	.02[c]	—.01	.02	—.09[c]	—.00	—.05	—.03	—.10[c]	.01
Generation	.01	.07[c]	.37[c]	.20[c]	.40[c]	.18[c]	.37	.32[c]	.32[c]	.22[c]
Age	.02[c]	.00	.03[c]	—.00	.02[c]	—.00	.00	—.00	.03[c]	—.01
Previously married	.07[c]	.04[c]	.02	—.02	—.01	—.00	.09[c]	.01	.08[c]	.03
Constant	.09	—.13	—.15	—.18	—.17	—.17	.05	—.27	.35	—.15
R^2	.075[c]	.056[c]	.037[c]	.054[c]	.033[c]	.042[c]	.054[c]	.088[c]	.104[c]	.101

[a] *Unstandardized regression coeffficients. These can be interpreted as the number of percentage-points change in the probability of marrying out associated with a unit change in the independent variable.*

[b] *ExA = a dichotomous variable which is coded "1" if marriage is exogamous.*
ExB = a dichotomous variable which is coded "1" if marriage is exogamous with a third-generation American.

[c] *Statistically significant at .05 level.*

zero-order correlations presented in Table 21. For the regression analysis normal rules for handling dichotomous variables (Johnston, 1963: 176-207) were adhered to. This means that one category (Manhattan) was omitted from the equation and the other borough coefficients can be interpreted as differences from that omitted category (net of the effects of other control variables). The dispersion effect remains visible for Puerto Ricans, South Americans, and Dominicans and for all groups in the case of residence in Staten Island. Puerto Rican brides from Queens and Staten Island have exogamy (ExA) levels which are 31 and 33 percentage points higher, respectively, than those of Puerto Ricans living in Manhattan; while Puerto Rican brides in the Bronx and Brooklyn have levels 9 and 7 percentage points lower, respectively, than those of brides living in Manhattan. There is no need to repeat the description for other groups since the addition of controls for occupation, generation, and other factors has not altered the pattern described earlier. In general, the dispersion pattern is stronger for overall exogamy (ExA) than for exogamy with third-generation Americans though it exists in both cases. This indicates that at least two dispersion methods are operating: (1) endogamy is higher in the borough where a group is concentrated; and (2) higher exogamy rates in other boroughs correspond to higher concentrations of other Hispanics since they apparently involve intermarriage with other Hispanics more than with third-generation Americans.

Several other conclusions need to be mentioned. There is a fairly consistent negative relationship between Catholic ceremony and exogamy. Again this is more true for general exogamy (ExA) than for exogamy with third-generation Americans (ExB). This conforms with the expectation that, among other factors, movement away from the church is related to movement away from group-specific institutions. Age and previous marriage status are positively related to exogamy in general (the exceptions are not statistically significant). This was expected since both variables index the opportunity to meet and interact with more diverse sets of individuals. Finally, generational status retains its strong positive association with exogamy. This means that generational differences are not functions of differences in occupation or dispersion patterns. Only for Puerto Ricans is generation unrelated to exogamy (ExA) and this is true when the control variables are not included (see Chapter III). While in general the net generational effect is weaker for exogamy with third-generation Americans, the reverse is true for Puerto Ricans. However, this coefficient is still smaller than for any of the other Hispanic groups.

There are no significant inconsistencies between the results reported for brides and the patterns found for grooms (Table 24). This means that

marital assimilation processes operate symmetrically with respect to sex for all Hispanic groups. It should be pointed out that the levels of explained variance, ranging from .031 for South American grooms to .136 for Cuban grooms, are respectable. Roughly translated, respectable means that enough variance is being explained to indicate that the variables under consideration are important, but a great deal remains unexplained. Clearly, more precise indicators of status, and other data on peer contacts and acculturation would greatly augment our explanatory power.

C. Intermarriage as a Determinant

As was argued earlier, intermarriage is a powerful indicator of assimilation. Not only does it entail intimate contact between individuals, but high rates of intermarriage can only occur when structural conditions do not inhibit the routine interaction of members of different ethnic groups at many societal levels. Consequently, intermarriage represents more than an end product; it also impacts on other aspects of life. In reality, the relationships between marital assimilation and other structural outcomes such as occupational achievement, acculturation, and residential mobility patterns are complex processes. Given a richer array of background and outcome variables these relationships could be explored in more detail, though such issues beg for longitudinal data. Here we treat occupational status as a dependent variable merely to provide an indication of the importance of marital assimilation as another area of social life, and to remind the reader that it should be viewed as more than an outcome of social processes. The caveat that the data are inadequate to the task applies now more than ever.

Table 25 presents the regression of occupational status on exogamy and other background variables for brides and grooms. Separate equations were calculated using ExA and ExB as the indicators of assimilation; however, since coefficients other than those for the exogamy variables and R^2 did not vary significantly, they were presented as if only one equation had been computed.

Exogamy is strongly related to occupational status for brides of all groups. However, this must be qualified by pointing out that only exogamy with third-generation Americans is consistently related to occupational status. Only for Puerto Ricans are both indicators significantly related to status, while ExB is significantly related for all groups. The strongest relationship occurs for South Americans and Dominicans. For each of these groups, marrying a third-generation American is associated with approximately a half-point increase in occupational status. This corresponds to more than one-half a standard

TABLE 24
Regression of Outgroup Marriage Indicators[a]
on Background Variables for Grooms
of Each Ethnic Group, New York City, 1975

Independent Variables	Puerto Ricans		South Americans		Dominicans		Central Americans		Cubans	
	Dependent Variable[b]									
	ExA	ExB	ExA	ExB	ExA	ExB	ExA	ExB	ExA	ExB
Groom's occupation	.01[c]	.01[c]	.01	.02[c]	.02[c]	.01	.03	.04[c]	.04[c]	.03[c]
Bronx	—.11[c]	—.01[c]	.11[c]	—.05[c]	.10[c]	.00	.03	.04	.05	—.00
Brooklyn	—.08[c]	.01	.09[c]	.02	.19[c]	.02	—.02	.05[c]	.06	.08[c]
Staten Island	.39[c]	.40	.13	.22[c]	.28[c]	.45[c]	.15	.29[c]	.22	.03
Queens	.29[c]	.16[c]	—.12[c]	—.01	.04	.06[c]	.14[c]	.09[c]	—.01	.09[c]
Catholic	—.08[c]	—.01	—.05[c]	—.02	—.18[c]	—.02[c]	—.12	—.06[c]	—.17[c]	—.02
Generation	.05[c]	.10[c]	.41[c]	.23[c]	.36[c]	.27[c]	.40[c]	.18[c]	.32[c]	.28[c]
Age	.02[c]	—.01[c]	—.02[c]	—.01[c]	—.01	—.00	—.04	—.02[c]	—.01	—.02[c]
Previously married	.04[c]	.02[c]	.08[c]	—.01	—.06[c]	.00	.06	.04	—.05	—.02
Constant	.04	—.06	.28	—.09	.07	—.24	23	—.10	.31	—.08
R^2	.071[c]	.063[c]	.057[c]	.031[c]	.060[c]	.088[c]	.069[c]	.050[c]	.108[c]	.136[c]

a) See note (a) in Table 22.

b) See note (b) in Table 22.

c) See note (c) in Table 22.

deviation in occupational status and constitutes a significant increase. It is larger than the net generational differences in occupational status which range from .03 to .34 unit changes. Nevertheless, one suspects it should be larger. It may well be that occupation affects intermarriage probabilities more than the reverse. Our problem is that we lack other indicators of ethnic differences such as fertility or political behaviors that might be more directly impacted by marital assimilation (see Gurak, 1978, 1979). The key finding, again, is that only intermarriage with third-generation Americans is consistently and strongly related to occupational status. Viewing assimilation as a determinant of occupational career patterns, this finding indicates that more assimilated women obtain higher status occupations. Again we must emphasize the complex relationship between occupational attainment and assimilation: one influences the other. These data are presented only to emphasize this point and not to establish the dominant causal order.

Assimilation, indexed by exogamy, does not influence the groom's occupational attainment to the same degree as it does for the bride. Far less variance is explained and the regression coefficients for exogamy are much smaller. Nevertheless, the same basic pattern exists: exogamy with third-generation Americans is the stronger indicator of occupational attainment.

For both brides and grooms, having a Catholic ceremony is positively related to occupational status, as are generation, age, and remarriage status. The age relationship merely reflects the well-established intra-generational career pattern: most people obtain better second jobs than their first jobs, and age indexes thi (Blau and Duncan, 1967). Second-generation individuals have had the opportunity to obtain the training and orientation that facilitate occupational attainment, and they have not experienced the migration-induced disruptions to careers experienced by first-generation individuals. The meaning of the remarriage status relationship is unclear, unless it is picking up another aspect of life-cycle effects missed by age. The positive relationship between occupational status and Catholic ceremony probably indicates that people from economically better-off families are the ones who can afford the celebrations associated with a church wedding. Since Catholic ceremony is negatively related to exogamy, and occupational status and Catholic ceremony are positively related, it becomes impossible to pin down the the "typical" social meaning of Catholic ceremony. On the one hand, it appears to be an index of traditionalism; on the other hand, its relationship to occupational status undercuts that interpretation and indicates that it is measuring several underlying tendencies.

D. Determinants of Residential Dispersion

Of all the information contained in or extracted from the marriage record, borough (dispersion) has proven to be the most powerful correlate of exogamy. We were able to predict the boroughs that should be associated with low and high rates of exogamy for specific groups; and we found that these dispersion effects were not reduced when the influences of other factors were controlled. Can we provide any insight into who is most likely to live in a dispersed context? Our answer is largely negative. Of all possible correlates only exogamy is strongly correlated to dispersion (living in Queens or Staten Island for Puerto Ricans; in any borough but Queens and Manhattan for South Americans; and outside of Manhattan for Dominicans).

A multiple-regression analysis could explain only one-half of one percent of the variance in dispersion for Puerto Ricans, somewhat more for South Americans, and 2.4 percent for Dominicans. These equations did not include exogamy as an independent variable because we know that relationship was strong and we were seeking only to determine the role of other factors. It could be argued that dispersed families are already more assimilated and this causes an increase in the incidence of intermarriage; or families could become located in dispersed settings for other reasons, and the low ethnic density could play a primary role in increasing the exogamy rate of people so situated. Once again we cannot determine which explanation is best. We only know that we cannot provide a profile which would predict dispersion for individuals.

Table 26 provides descriptive information on the correlates of dispersion in the form of zero-order correlation coefficients. Even generation of residence is weakly related. Second-generation individuals are only slightly more likely than first-generation Hispanics to live outside of the borough of principal concentration of their groups. One finding of interest is the stronger correlation between generation of spouse and dispersion than between own generation and dispersion. One is more likely to marry a second- or third-generation individual in a dispersed setting. This pattern is clearly a consequence, and not a determinant, of dispersion.

E. Summary

In this chapter we have introduced several new indicators of the social situations of Hispanic brides and grooms, and we have explored the relationships between these variables and exogamy in a multivariate context. If we had set as our goal the estimation of powerful predictive

TABLE 25

Regression of Occupations[a] on Exogamy and Background Variables For Brides and Grooms, New York City, 1975

Independent Variables	Puerto Ricans		South Americans		Dominicans		Central Americans		Cubans	
	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G
ExA[b]	.22[c]	.07[c]	.12	.04	.00	.07	.02	.07	.10	.14[c]
ExB[b]	.31[c]	.07[c]	.52[c]	.13[c]	.51[c]	.15[c]	.20[c]	.19[c]	.37[c]	.18[c]
Age	.11[c]	.03[c]	.10[c]	.06[c]	.09[c]	.07[c]	.08[c]	.07[c]	.13[c]	.05[c]
Bronx	—.04	—01	—.16[c]	—.11[c]	.12[c]	.01	—.24[c]	—.10	.07	.09
Brooklyn	.02	—.07[c]	.00	—.09[c]	.02	—.13[c]	.13	.04	.01	.13[c]
Staten Island	—.85[c]	—.54[c]	—.65[c]	—.02	—.10	.27	1.93[c]	—.14	.01	—.01
Queens	.12[c]	.10[c]	.08	.09[c]	.15[c]	.08[c]	.08	.18[c]	.35	.14
Catholic	.34[c]	.13[c]	.23[c]	.07	.17[c]	.04	.03	—.02	.34	.12
Generation	.38[c]	.10[c]	.41[c]	.33[c]	.33[c]	.04	.11	.32[c]	.29[c]	—.01
Previously married	.08[c]	.12[c]	—.01	.12[c]	.04	.04	.13	—.01	.02	.17[c]
Constant	.57	1.87	.87	1.54	.88	1.78	1.19	1.66	.76	1.90
R^2 ExA	.054[c]	.014	.037[c]	.025	.034	.018	.055[c]	.036	.049[c]	.039
ExB	.054[c]	.014	.052[c]	.026	.043[c]	.018	.057[c]	.041[c]	.055[c]	.039

[a] *Unstandardized regression coeffficients are interpreted as in Tables 22 and 23 except that the dependent variables range from 1 to 4 rather than from 0 to 1.*

[b] *See note (b) in Table 23.*

[c] *Statistically significant at .05 level.*

models we would now be less than satisfied. However, recognizing the limits of marriage-record data our goal has been the more modest maximization of information about New York's Hispanic population. The multivariate analysis adds to our growing descriptive profile of these populations.

A relatively high percentage of the 1975 Hispanic marriages were remarriages, leading to the initial observation that the social conditions related to migration and adjustment were straining Hispanic marital relationships. While such strains may indeed exist, closer examination showed the Hispanic remarriage rates to be lower than the national average for the United States. This leads to the conclusion that New York City's Hispanic populations are coping with such strains quite well; their high rate of remarriage may be only a response to the more general social forces which have been increasing divorce and remarriage rates in the U.S. It should be remembered that we possess only part of the picture at this time: we do not know what percentage of divorced or separated Hispanics have remarried, or whether that proportion differs significantly from the United States norm.

While Hispanics marry for the first time at older ages than do average Americans, this appears to be a function of disruptions of life-cycle timing caused by the migration process. Among second-generation Hispanics only the South and Central Americans continue to marry at ages older than the national average.

Using the borough in which the license to marry was obtained as an indicator of place of residence, the analysis found that Hispanics living in boroughs with relatively high concentrations of their national-origin group had higher than average levels of endogamy. Those living in "dispersed" boroughs had lower than average levels of endogamy. For example, Puerto Ricans were far more likely to marry other Puerto Ricans if they were based in the Bronx or Brooklyn than if they were based in Queens; while for South Americans, who are concentrated in Queens, the reverse pattern obtained. This dispersal effect fits well with theoretical and empirical work on the role of proximity in mate selection. The relationship persists when other background variables are controlled. Unfortunately, we have been unable to uncover important correlates of dispersion within the confines of the marriage-record data.

Two sets of multivariate regression equations were produced: the first explored the extent to which we can account for variation in exogamy using as extensive a set of predictors as the data permitted; the second explored the ability of these variables to explain the variations in occupational status. In the latter case, exogamy became an independent variable. In both sets of equations, two indicators of exogamy — marriage

TABLE 26

Zero-Order Correlations[a] Between Living in an Ethnically Dispersed Setting and Background Variables for Puerto Rican, South American, and Dominican Brides and Grooms

	Puerto Ricans		South Americans		Dominicans	
	Brides	Grooms	Brides	Grooms	Brides	Grooms
Generation of bride	.05	.11	—.00	.03	.04	.10
Generation of groom	.12	.04	.04	.04	.07	.04
Occupation of bride	.03	.03	—.05	—.05	—.02	—.04
Occupation of groom	.03	.02	—.08	—.06	—.00	—.02
Age of bride	.01	—.04	.05	.01	—.11	—.09
Age of groom	.01	—.03	.03	.02	—.09	—.10
Remarriage—bride	.05	.02	—.01	—.04	—.12	—.12
Remarriage—groom	.04	.04	.01	—.02	—.10	—.10
Catholic	.01	—.02	—.04	—.01	—.02	—.02
ExA	.20	.20	07	.14	.09	.13
ExB	.17	.17	.03	00	.08	.08

[a]*Pearsonian Product—Moment Coefficient.*

with anyone belonging to a different national origin group and marriage with a third-generation American — were used.

The multivariate regressions produced several interesting findings. First, generation of residence and dispersion persisted as strong correlates of both types of exogamy in the presence of extensive controls. The only exception to this pattern was the lack of a generational difference for Puerto Ricans. Second, outgroup marriage with third-generation Americans proved to be much more strongly associated with occupational status than did the general indicator of exogamy. This finding supports the observation that not all outgroup marriages index assimilation to the same degree. More important than merely marrying outside of one's national-origin group is the extent to which the social distance separating an individual from the core society has been reduced (Gurak and Kritz, 1978; Alba, 1976; Laumann, 1973).[13] Individuals who have attained relatively high-status occupational positions are much more likely to routinely interact with third-generation Americans; this structured proximity, then, influences the selection of marital partners.

While we emphasize the inadequacy of the data to the task, we have tried to present intermarriage as a determinant of other life events. This approach recognizes that marriage occurs after all other background events; however, it assumes that intermarriage merely indexes a more complex set of life-style patterns: more acculturated and more assimilated individuals are more likely to intermarry. But can we say that more assimilated individuals are likely to behave in ways systematically different from less assimilated individuals? Other studies (Gurak, 1978, 1979; Alba, 1976) have found this to be true in areas such as fertility and participation patterns. Unfortunately, the marriage-record data do not provide indicators of the many areas where we might expect assimilation to have an influence. We present occupational status as a dependent variable and find intermarriage to be positively associated with it, though not in a strong manner. On a more general level, few of the background indicators available to us prove to be strongly predictive of occupational attainment. This presentation only hints at an area of study that deserves far more empirical attention.

---

(13) While the text may create the implication that assimilation is a necessarily positive occurrence, we do not view it in that manner. Movement away from one's own group and towards another may be a good or a bad thing for an individual or a group, depending on personal and social values and the alternatives available to individuals and groups. Here we index only the empirical pattern which existed in New York City in 1975.

VI. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The analysis of Hispanic intermarriage presented in this monograph permits some conclusions to be drawn concerning the social situation of Hispanic ethnic groups in New York City; it also raises questions that cannot be answered with the materials immediately at hand; and it leads to some recommendations aimed at improving our ability to monitor the social and economic conditions of Hispanics and to provide them with services more efficiently. The first part of this chapter outlines the major findings which have emerged from the analysis. We then conclude with a series of recommendations directed to both researchers and policymakers.

A. Major Conclusions

Hispanics constituted an important segment of the marrying population of New York City in 1975: approximately 22 percent of all individuals who married. This percentage almost certainly exceeds the proportion of Hispanics in the city's population because marriages occur at relatively young ages, and it is in those age strata that Hispanics are concentrated. Nevertheless, the marriage data indicate that the Hispanic population of New York City exceeds common estimates of its size. The data also demonstrate the numerical importance of non-Puerto Rican Hispanics in the city: close to one-half of the Hispanics who married in 1975 were not Puerto Ricans; they were Dominicans, Cubans, Colombians, Mexicans, or other Latin Americans. The non-Puerto Rican Hispanics represent recent immigrant groups — only a tiny proportion were born in the United States — and their numbers are growing fast. Some evidence indicates that the growth of the Puerto Rican population in New York City has halted as Puerto Ricans increase their rates of return migration and continue to settle in large numbers in other cities of the United States. Given these trends, New York City will continue to become more of a diverse, cosmopolitan, Hispanic city.

The incidence of intermarriage among Hispanics in New York City is quite high, especially for the second generation. Only the Puerto Rican intermarriage rate appears to be low. Overall, most Hispanic

intermarriages are with other Hispanics, reflecting the relatively small social distances which separate the different Hispanic ethnic groups. Among second-generation Hispanics there is a marked increase in outmarriages for all second-generation Hispanic groups, with the exception of Puerto Ricans. The rate of exogamous marriage actually declines from first to second generation for Puerto Rican brides in the city. Among second-generation Hispanics, Puerto Ricans are by far the least likely to marry non-Hispanics and the most likely to marry within their own group. The implications of the distinctiveness of the Puerto Rican pattern are discussed in more detail below.

Using occupation as the indicator of socioeconomic status, major differences in the average status of the Hispanic groups emerge. Cubans, South Americans, and Central Americans have significantly higher socioeconomic status than do either Puerto Ricans or Dominicans. Among second-generation brides and grooms, Puerto Rican occupational status is lower than that of all other Hispanics including Dominicans. The relatively strong correlation between intermarriage and occupational status suggests that the background status of the non-Puerto Rican Hispanic migrants contributes to these higher intermarriage rates. The finding of the relatively low status of second-generation Puerto Ricans once again raises an issue that begs for explanation.

While marriage records provide information that is less than ideal for examining the determinants and consequences of intermarriage, they do provide the opportunity to make some progress. Several correlates of intermarriage were identified. Generation of residence is consistently and strongly related to intermarriage: only for Puerto Ricans do we fail to find a sharp increase in intermarriage among the second generation. This finding, besides calling attention to the Puerto Rican situation, serves to validate the assumption that intermarriage is indexing assimilation since the passage of generations in a society is known to be associated with numerous dimensions of assimilation.

Occupational status is also positively related to intermarriage. The higher a person's status, the higher is the probability that the person will intermarry. The relationship emerges most consistently for one indicator of intermarriage: marriage with a non-Hispanic. Marriage with other Hispanics probably indicates a lower level of assimilation into the dominant society than does marriage with a non-Hispanic. Given that assumption, then occupational success and assimilation go hand in hand, though we cannot really specify which comes first: occupational advancement, or acculturation and assimilation. Dominican and Puerto Rican women who marry outside of their ethnic group tend to be upwardly mobile; that is, outmarrying women from these groups are

more likely to marry a male of higher status than are endogamous women. Given the lower average status of Dominican and Puerto Rican women, this finding makes sense: upwardly mobile women from low status groups are less likely to have a large pool of potential mates in their ethnic group who are of higher status.

The relationship between intermarriage, on the one hand, and occupational status and upward mobility, on the other hand, points to the association between assimilation and social mobility. We have alluded to this association several times when noting that we could not specify whether intermarriage represented an independent assimilation process which subsequently affected social status and activities, or represented the outcome of an economic process of movement into higher status positions. Milton Gordon (1964), in emphasizing the concept of "eth-class," argued that persons of high social status interact more easily with persons of the same status in other cultural groups than with lower status persons of their own cultural group. This can explain the higher rates of intermarriage among persons of higher socioeconomic status. Gordon also points out, however, that structural pluralism has been a continuing phenomenon in the United States; namely, persons of distinct ethnic groups of all classes tend to remain in primary group relationships with persons of their own culture. Assimilation, therefore, cannot be adequately explained by upward socioeconomic mobility alone. Despite the significant attention given to ethnic assimilation in the United States, empirical research has not yet adequately specified the mechanisms of the process of assimilation.

Both age at marriage and remarriage status are, predictably, positively associated with intermarriage. A large body of empirical research makes it clear that the pool of potential mates for older and for remarrying individuals is restricted in ways that cause increases in social differences between spouses. Current increases in age at marriage and in remarriage rates indicate an independent source of increasing intermarriage rates.

The predominance of civil ceremonies and the relative frequency of Protestant ceremonies for Hispanic populations who are culturally Catholic are not decisive indicators of religious beliefs or practice. They do, however, reflect considerable social distance from expected Catholic practice. This may be a carry-over from practices in Hispanic areas of origin or an adoption of a predominant American style. The apparent lack of involvement in religion suggests patterns of adjustment and assimilation which differ significantly from those of earlier immigrant groups for whom religion played a central role.

Propinquity or the relative dispersion of an ethnic group proved to be

the strongest determinant of intermarriage. Those groups, such as Cubans, with relatively small proportions of their members in New York City have higher rates of intermarriage in the city than elsewhere. Conversely, those groups, such as Puerto Ricans, with large concentrations in the city have lower rates of intermarriage in the city than elsewhere. Within the city itself, members of groups who live in the boroughs where their ethnic group is concentrated have much lower intermarriage rates than members of the same group living in other boroughs. This pattern emerged most strongly for Dominicans, Puerto Ricans, and South Americans. Perhaps of as much interest as the relationship between intermarriage and residential dispersion is the distinct residential settlement patterns of the various Hispanic groups. These settlement patterns, even more than the occupational differences among the groups, underline the distinctiveness of the cultures and institutions of the Hispanic populations of the city. Unfortunately, we were unable to determine other correlates of residential dispersion. Consequently, we cannot specify whether dispersion represents a key cause of assimilation or merely results from it. In any case, it appears certain that dispersion does contribute to a broad range of assimilation processes.

Differences in group size were also shown to strongly influence intermarriage rates and the social distances separating groups. The larger an ethnic group is relative to others in a population, the lower will be its intermarriage rate — all other things being equal. This results from basic mathematical processes and from the effect of group size on the density of ethnic institutions and activities. The relatively large size of the Puerto Rican population does account for part of its low rate of intermarriage; however, it cannot explain this population's low second-generation rate or its low probability of marrying non-Hispanics. We turn to some speculations on what could account for the Puerto Rican pattern.

B. The Puerto Rican Intermarriage Pattern

How can we explain the low rate of intermarriage among second-generation Puerto Ricans, and their relatively large social distance from non-Hispanics? As we noted above, relative group size and concentration contribute to this pattern, but cannot totally account for it. Several possibilities come to mind as candidates for further investigation: (1) Second-generation Puerto Ricans may be experiencing an increased emphasis on Puerto Rican identity — perhaps related to the issue of Puerto Rican independence. (2) The Hispanic community in New York City may have become large enough to support a more separate or

isolated ethnic community.[14] (3) Residential and occupational segregation by ethnicity and social class may be affecting Puerto Ricans more than other groups. (4) The special status of Puerto Rico may make the maintenance of ethnic institutions easier and may discourage commitments to permanent settlement. Puerto Ricans can travel back and forth to the island with considerably more ease than members of other groups can to their homelands. Travel costs are low and there are no immigration restrictions. (5) Finally, we may be witnessing the results of selective outmigration from New York City, with more assimilated second-generation Puerto Ricans being more likely to move from and/or marry outside of New York City.

We cannot evaluate the relative importance of these speculative explanations. We have no comparative data on the strength of the ethnic identity of members of the various Hispanic groups, nor of changes in Puerto Rican identity over time. While it appears reasonable to assume that residential and occupational segregation contributes to the low rate of Puerto Rican intermarriage, we will have to observe the course of the development of the economically similar Dominican population as the size of its second generation grows before we will have the comparative perspective we need to properly address this issue.

To study the impact of the special status of Puerto Rico, more than any other topic, requires comparative data. Does the lack of this special status affect the pattern of interaction with the homeland for Dominicans or for Colombians? The special problems of collecting data on the non-Puerto Rican Hispanic immigrant groups have limited the accumulation of knowledge that would permit an answer to these questions.

The argument that more assimilated Puerto Ricans are more likely to leave the city does receive some support. The incidence and prevalence rates of intermarriage of Puerto Ricans living outside of the city are much higher than the rates observed for New York City. We know that residential dispersion is associated with increasing intermarriage. Census data indicate that the economic situation of Puerto Ricans in the New York metropolitan area is worse than in the rest of the country (Wilber and Hagan, 1975). But we do not have direct measurements of the characteristics of migrants from New York who settle elsewhere on the mainland. Also, a growing body of data indicates that a high proportion of Puerto Rican settlers outside of the city came directly from Puerto Rico

(14) The popular reference to second-generation Puerto Ricans in New York as "Nuyoricans" reflects both an emphasis on identity and the emergence of a new cultural entity: one that mixes new ways of life with a continuing interest in the political status of Puerto Rico.

rather than from New York (Vergara, 1979; Chung, 1975). Lacking better data on the internal migration patterns of Puerto Ricans, we cannot assess the relative contribution of the dispersion thesis.

The speculations provided here represent only a few of the possible explanations for the low intermarriage rates among Puerto Ricans. Various combinations of factors may interact to produce the observed results. In any case, we require much new investigation in order to be able to specify the social processes which are at work.

C. Recommendations

This has been a study of intermarriage patterns, and not one of the effectiveness of a social service system such as that presented by Alers (1978) in his study of the health conditions of Puerto Ricans in New York City. Consequently, our recommendations are more diffuse than the ones made for specifically targeted studies. We, of course, make no recommendations concerning the desirability of more or less intermarriage since this is a personal matter to be determined by the individual; in addition, the consequences of various rates of intermarriage for whole societies remain only vaguely specified. Nevertheless, the use of administrative data and some of the conclusions generated by the analysis suggest administrative and research needs.

Recommendation 1

> *Administrative records for general social events, such as marriage, should be standardized and expanded.*

We have worked with the New York City marriage records which provide more data than those of most other jurisdictions in the United States, but they fail to give routine background information such as educational attainment or length of residence in the city. In many other jurisdictions, place of birth of parents is not listed, and in some, own place of birth is not specified. Merely standardizing records to the content of New York's would improve our ability to monitor the social conditions of numerous groups; minor additions to the New York forms would greatly improve this ability.

But why should more data be collected on these records? Their primary purpose is administrative and not research. Carried to an extreme, the marriage records, as administrative devices, require the recording of far less data than is currently obtained. We believe that administrative records represent a potentially rich source of social indicator data which

could be obtained without placing a burden on the administrative function. For example, the addition of a question on education or length of residence to existing forms would not increase the number of pages required, nor appreciably increase the time costs to applicants or to administrative staff.

Recently, much attention has been given to the use of administrative data in the search for reliable estimates of population size and composition, and for data on the social conditions of hard-to-study groups.[15] Standardization and improvement of such data will receive more attention in the near future, though we suspect that progress will be slow.

Recommendation 2

Social programs aimed at Hispanics should pay more attention to the diversity of the Hispanic ethnic groups living in New York City.

While individual practitioners may be sensitive to the cultural and socioeconomic differences of members of different groups, this diversity receives little official recognition. Administrative records of agencies such as the Board of Education and hospitals are not known for their careful determination of ethnicity.[16] Concerning Hispanics, Puerto Ricans are usually identified, albeit incompletely, but when non-Puerto Rican Hispanics are identified it is in one residual category. The present analysis has demonstrated that this lumping together of groups cannot be

(15) Any interest in the Hispanic populations in New York City must include a concern for the problems of survival and adjustment of the illegal or undocumented aliens who live in New York and in other parts of the country. No agreed-upon estimate of the undocumented alien population exists. The present study probably includes a significant number of them. Without doubt, these data cannot be viewed as representing the total Hispanic population — especially illegals — but the data do increment our knowledge of the social condition of that population. More coordinated efforts are needed using different data sources,and focusing on both population size and composition estimates, and on the social, economic, political, and psychological adjustment patterns of illegal immigrants (see Keely, 1977; Robinson, 1979).

(16) For example, the Board of Education groups all non-Puerto Rican Hispanics into one category, even though this category is much larger than other separate categories such as American-Indians and Alaskan

justified on the basis of small numbers: the non-Puerto Rican Hispanic population in New York City is large and growing. The analysis has also demonstrated that Puerto Ricans, Cubans, Dominicans, South Americans, and Central Americans differ markedly in their socioeconomic status and in their relationships to the non-Hispanic population.

Not all programs need devise special modalities for each Hispanic group, but increased administrative sensitivity to Hispanic diversity should assist the productive targeting of social actions. Once again, this suggests the need for improvements in administrative record-keeping procedures. [17]

Recommendation 3

Research should be conducted on the relationship of intermarriage to individual adjustment processes.

While intermarriage is an indicator of assimilation, it may also be indexing adjustment problems brought on by increased isolation from ethnic networks. In general, we lack sound data on the individual costs and benefits of assimilation. The finding of a strong relationship between residential dispersion and outgroup marriage underlines the need to consider the psychological consequences of assimilation.

Under some conditions intermarriage might be associated with a

---

natives, or Asians. While Puerto Ricans are identified by their own place of birth and place of parents' birth, Spanish surname is the only indicator used to locate other Hispanics: consequently, other Hispanics are undercounted. The rapid rate of increase of the non-Puerto Rican Hispanic groups renders the need for improved official record-keeping extremely important.

(17) A study of the mental-health conditions and needs of Hispanic children in New York City, which is currently in progress at the Hispanic Research Center, has encountered situations in which the incompleteness and vagueness of administrative records render them nearly useless for even administrative purposes. In general, rendering data adequate for research purposes should greatly enhance the administrative functions of such data. Recent criticisms of the administrative data base of the Immigration and Naturalization Service provide yet another example of inefficiency in data monitoring. (U.S. House of Representatives, 1978: 50).

reduction in stress related to adjustment in a foreign culture; however, whether such a reduction occurs or whether adjustment problems are intensified depends on the conditions which have led to intermarriage. For example, if intermarriage is the end product of a long acculturation and assimilation process, then intermarriage will not likely cause adjustment problems; however, if intermarriage occurs, for example, because of proximity in residence or workplace, between people of markedly different cultures, then problems of marginalization and adjustment may occur to some extent. So little is known about the adjustment mechanisms related to assimilation, or about the different types of assimilation processes at the individual level, that today's high and increasing level of immigration cries out for sound research in this area.[18]

Recommendation 4

Comparative research should be conducted on the social, economic, and political situations of Hispanic ethnic groups.

This study has emphasized the diversity that characterizes the members of different Hispanic groups. Nevertheless, the results also indicate that the social distance, indexed by intermarriage, separating the various Hispanic groups is very small. We require an analysis of the dynamics of the relationships of the various Hispanic groups in diverse areas such as politics and economic enterprises. To what extent are the Hispanic groups effectively functioning as a single collective in various social spheres? Anecdotal evidence exists concerning instances of both competition and cooperation; however, an authoritative overview is lacking. The distinctiveness of the residential settlement pattern of Hispanic ethnic groups in New York City underlines the problematic nature of the query: Is there a single Hispanic community?

This call for research is meant to focus attention on both the continued growth of New York's Hispanic community and on the changes in the ethnic composition of that community.

---

(18) The National Institute of Child Health and Human Development has recently issued a call for research on "The Implications of International Migration for the United States" which includes research on adjustment problems of migrants. This call has been viewed as a response to the 1978 report of the Congressional Select Committee on Population which noted the lack of attention paid to migration and the problems of migrants (U.S. House of Representatives, 1978).

Recommendation 5

Authoritative explanations should be sought for the distinctiveness of the Puerto Rican intermarriage pattern.

Is the social isolation of the Puerto Rican community increasing? If so, does this primarily result from changes in Puerto Rican identity and the growth of the Hispanic community and institutions in the city; or does it result from occupational and residential segregation patterns produced by, among other causes, the economic deterioration and correlated shifts in population and job composition of the city; or does it result from selective migration of individuals who are more assimilated from the city? If selective migration exists, what factors influence that migration? Considerably more attention needs to be given to the social and economic situation of the Puerto Rican populations living outside of New York City.

Recommendation 6

Significantly more attention should be given to the collection of benchmark social-indicator data for Hispanic minorities in the United States.

Various agencies, such as the Census Bureau or the Board of Education of New York City, do provide information of this kind; however, very little reliable information exists for most groups concerning a broad range of phenomena such as migration patterns, basic needs, and intergroup relations. Information needs at a local level are greater than at the national level. In a similar vein, a significant need exists for field studies which pursue issues, such as the adjustment correlates of intermarriage, raised by benchmark social-indicator data. Such field studies, while extremely important, can be placed in proper perspective only when the general situation of the populations in question has been adequately monitored. This recommendation overlaps with previous ones since it calls for both research and modifications in administrative procedures. Much more, however, can be done with administrative records as they currently exist. For example, serious attention should be given to replicating studies such as the current one at regular intervals. Such studies should coincide, whenever possible, with other data-collection operations such as the 1980 Census.

REFERENCES

Abramson, Harold

1973 *Ethnic Diversity in Catholic America.* New York: Wiley.

Alba, Richard D.

1976 "Social Assimilation Among American Catholic National Origin Groups." *American Sociological Review* 41: 1030-1046

Alba, Richard D. and Ronald G. Kessler

1979 "Patterns of Interethnic Marriage Among Catholic Americans." *Social Forces* 57, 4 (June): 1124-1140

Alers, Jose Oscar

1978 *Puerto Ricans and Health: Findings From New York City.* Hispanic Research Center, Monograph No. 1. New York: Fordham University.

Barron, Milton

1946 *People Who Intermarry.* Syracuse, N.Y.: University of Syracuse Press.

Besanceney, Paul H.

1965 "On Reporting Rates of Intermarriage." *American Journal of Sociology* 70, 6 (May): 717-72

Blau, Peter M. and Otis Dudley Duncan

1967 *The American Occupational Structure.* New York: Wiley.

Board of Education of New York City

1977 Annual Pupil Ethnic Census. Office of Educational Statistics. New York: (October).

Board of Education of New York City

1979 Bureau of Attendance, Statistical Unit. Personal communication.

Bogardus, Emory S.

1925 "Measuring Social Distance." *Journal of Applied Sociology* 9, 299-308

Bogardus, Emory S.

1959 *Social Distance.* Los Angeles: Antioch Press

Bugelski, B.R.
1961 "Assimilation through Intermarriage." *Social Forces* 40 (December) 148-153.

Carliner, Geoffrey
1975 "Has the Melting Pot Worked?" Institute for Research on Poverty. Discussion Paper: University of Wisconsin, Madison.

Chaney, Elsa M.
1977 "The Colombian Diaspora in New York City." Paper prepared for the Workshop on U.S. Immigration: Research Perspectives. National Institute of Child Health and Human Development. Belmont Conference Center (May).

Chaney, Elsa M.
1976 "Colombian Migration to the United States, Part 2" in the *Dynamics of Migration: International Migration*. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution.

Chung, Hyung C.
1975 Survey of Spanish-speaking Manpower in the City of Bridgeport, Connecticut. Higher Education Center for Urban Studies.

Cohen, Steven M.
1977 "Socioeconomic Determinants of Interethnic Marriage and Friendship." *Social Forces* 55 (June): 997-1010.

Cooney, Rosemary Santana
1979 "Intercity Variations in Puerto Rican Female Labor Force Participation." *Journal of Human Resources* 14 (Spring): 222-235.

Cooney, Rosemary Santana and Alice Colon Warren
1979 "Declining Female Participation Among Puerto Rican New Yorkers: A Comparison with Native White non-Spanish New Yorkers." *Ethnicity* (Forthcoming).

Cruz, Carmen Inez and Juanita Casteno
1976 "Colombian Migration to the United States, Part 1" in the *Dynamics of Migration: International Migration*. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution.

Dean, Gillian and Douglas T. Gurak
1978 "Marital Homogamy the Second Time Around." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* (August): 559-570.

Departamento de Salud
1975 Informe Anual de Estadisticas Vitales. San Juan, Puerto Rico.

Dominguez, Virginia R.
1975 *From Neighbor to Stranger: The Dilemma of Caribbean Peoples in the United States*. New Haven: Antilles Research Program Occasional Paper #5, Yale University.

Drachsler, Julian
1921 *Intermarriage in New York City*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Economic Development Council of New York City.
1977 "The Illegal Alien and the Economy." Economic Development Council of New York City. New York.

Fishman, Joshua
1971 *Bilingualism in the Barrio*. Bloomington, Indiana: University of Indiana Press.

Fitzpatrick, Joseph P.
1966 "Intermarriage of Puerto Ricans in New York City." *American Journal of Sociology* 71 (January): 395-406.

Fitzpatrick, Joseph P.
1971 *Puerto Rican Americans: The Meaning of Migration to the Mainland*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Foley Wilson, Barbara
1977 "Brides and Grooms Born in Mexico, Cuba, Puerto Rico, and Other Latin American Countries and Married in 44 Reporting States in 1970." Presented at Annual Meeting of Population Association of America (April).

Ginorio, Angela B.
1979 A Comparison of Puerto Ricans in New York with Native Puerto Ricans and Native Americans on Two Measures of Acculturation: Gender Role and Racial Identification. New York: Fordham University, Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation.

Glick, Paul C. and Arthur J. Norton
1977 "Marrying, Divorcing, and Living Together in the U.S. Today." *Population Bulletin* Vol. 32, No. 5, Washington, D.C.: Population Reference Bureau, Inc.

Gordon, Milton M.
1964 *Assimilation in American Life*. New York: Oxford.

Grebler, Leo, Joan W. Moore, and Ralph C. Guzman
1970 *The Mexican-American People: The Nation's Second Largest Minority*. New York: Free Press.

Gurak, Douglas T.
1977 "Japanese-American Assimilation and Fertility Differences." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association (September).

Gurak, Douglas T.
1978 "Sources of Ethnic Fertility Differences: An Examination of

Five Minority Groups." *Social Science Quarterly* 59, 2 (September): 295-310.

Gurak, Douglas T.

1979 "Assimilation and Fertility: The Net Impact of Changes in Intermarriage and Residential Segregation." Unpublished.

Gurak, Douglas T. and Gillian Dean

1979 "The Remarriage Market: Factors Influencing the Selection of Second Husbands." *Journal of Divorce* 3, 2 (Winter).

Gurak, Douglas T. and Mary M. Kritz

1975 "Ethnic Intermarriage in the United States." Paper presented at Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association (September).

Gurak, Douglas T. and Mary M. Kritz

1978 "Intermarriage Patterns in the U.S.: Maximizing Information from the U.S. Census Public Use Samples." *Review of Public Data Use* 6, 2 (March): 33-43.

Gurak, Douglas T., Vivien Mota, Manuel Ortega, and Mary M. Kritz.

1979 "Female Employment in the Dominican Republic." Paper presented at Annual Meeting of Population Association of America (April).

Hendricks, Glen

1974 *Dominican Diaspora*. New York City: Columbia University Teachers College Press.

Herberg, Will

1960 *Protestant, Catholic, Jew*. New York: Doubleday.

Hernandez, Jose, Leo Estrada, and David Alvarez

1973 "Census Data and the Problem of Conceptually Defining the Mexican Population." *Social Science Quarterly* 53 (March): 671-687.

Jaffe, A.J., Ruth M. Cullen, and Thomas D. Boswell

1976 *Spanish-Americans in the United States: Changing Demographic Characteristics*. New York: Research Institute for the Study of Man.

Johnston, J.

1963 *Econometric Methods*. New York: McGraw Hill.

Kayal, P.M.

1978 "The Dominicans in N.Y.: Part 1" *Migration Today* (June).

Keely, Charles B.

1977 "Counting The Uncountable: Estimates of Undocumented Aliens in the United States." *Population and Development Review* 3, 4 (December): 473-481.

Keely, Charles B.
1979 *U.S. Immigration: A Policy Analysis.* New York: The Population Council.

Kennedy, R.J.R.
1944 "Single or Triple Melting Pot: Intermarriage Trends in New Haven, 1870-1940." *American Journal of Sociology* 49: 331-339.

Kritz, Mary M.
1979a "Shifting International Migration Patterns in the Americas." Paper presented at Annual Meeting of Population Association of America (April).

Kritz, Mary M.
1979b "International Migration Patterns in the Caribbean Basin." Paper presented at International Migration Conference, Bellagio Study and Conference Center, Como, Italy, (June 4-8).

Kritz, Mary M. and Douglas T. Gurak
1976 "Ethnicity and Fertility in the U.S.: An Analysis of 1970 Public Use Sample Data." *Review of Public Data Use* 4, 3 (May).

Kritz, Mary M. and Douglas T. Gurak
1979 "International Migration Trends in Latin America: Research and Data Survey." *International Migration Review,* 13, 3 (Fall).

Laumann, Edward O.
1973 *Bonds of Pluralism.* New York: Wiley.

Merton, Robert K.
1941 "Intermarriage and Social Structure: Fact and Theory." *Psychiatry* 4: 361-374.

Mittelbach, Frank G. and Joan W. Moore
1968 "Ethnic Endogamy: The Case of the Mexican-Americans." *American Journal of Sociology* (July): 50-62.

Monahan, Thomas
1971 "The Extent of Interdenominational Marriage in the United States." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion:* 85-92.

Monahan, Thomas
1973 "Some Dimensions of Interreligious Marriage in Indiana, 1962-67." *Social Forces* 52, 195-203.

Morales, Julio
1973 "Latinoamericanos en los Estados Unidos: Analisis del Crecimiento Intercensal de la Decada 1960 y Caracteristicas Basicas de 1970." *Revista Latinoamericana de Demografia.* CELADE.

Murguia, Edward and Parker Frisbie
1975 "Trends in Mexican-American Intermarriage." Paper

presented at Annual Meeting of Population Association of America (April).

New York Times
1978 "City Population Is at its Lowest since 1930's." (December 18).

Overseas Development Council
1977 *Agenda for Action, 1977*. New York: Praeger.

Park, Robert E.
1930 "Social Assimilation" in *Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, vol. 2, edited by Edwin R.A. Seligman and Alvin Johnson. New York: Macmillan.

Park, Robert E. and Ernest Burgess
1921 *Introduction to the Science of Sociology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Parkman, Margaret A. and Jack Sawyer
1967 "Dimensions of Ethnic Intermarriage in Hawaii." *American Sociological Review* 32: 593-607.

Petersen, William
1971 *Japanese-Americans: Oppression and Success*. New York: Random House.

Population and Development Review
1979 "The Problem of Illegal Aliens in the United States." Documents Section in *Population and Development Review* 5, 2 (June): 357-373.

Population Reference Bureau
1978 *1978 World Data Sheet*. Washington, D.C.: Population Reference Bureau, Inc.

Puerto Rico Planning Board
1975 Personal communication. San Juan, Puerto Rico.

Rawling, Stephen
1978 "Perspectives on American Husbands and Wives." *Current Population Reports: Special Studies*, Series P-23, No. 77. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Reichert, Josh and Douglas S. Massey
1979 "Patterns of Migration from a Rural Mexican Town to the United States: A Comparison of Legal and Illegal Migrants." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Population Association of America (April).

Robinson, J. Gregory
1979 "Estimating the Approximate Magnitude of the Illegal Alien

Population in the United States by the Analysis of Trends in Age-Specific Death Rates." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Population Association of America (April).

Rogg, Eleanor

1974 *The Assimilation of Cuban Exiles: The Role of Community and Class*. New York: Aberdeen Press.

Sassen-Koob, Saskia

1979 "Formal and Informal Associations: Dominicans and Colombians in New York." *International Migration Review* 13, 2 (Summer): 314-332.

Shavitt, Yossi

1978 "Ethnic Intermarriage in the United States." Working Paper 78-11 of the Center for Demography and Ecology, Madison: University of Wisconsin.

Thomas, John L.

1951 "The Factor of Religion in the Selection of Marriage Mates." *American Sociological Review*. 16: 487-491.

Travis, Harry

1976 "Religious In-Marriage and Intermarriage in Canada, 1934-1969." Working Paper 76-36, Center for Demography and Ecology. Madison: University of Wisconsin.

Ugalde, Antonio, Frank D. Bean and Gilbert Cardinas

1979 "International Migration from the Dominican Republic: Findings from a National Survey." *International Migration Review* 13, 2 (Summer): 235-254.

U.S. Bureau of the Census

1970 *1970 Census of the Population: Characteristics of the Population*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

U.S. Bureau of the Census

1972 *Public Use Samples of Basic Records from the 1970 Census: Description and Technical Documentation*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

U.S. Bureau of the Census

1973 *U.S. Census of Population: 1970; Subject Reports; Final Report PC(2)-1E*, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

U.S. Bureau of the Census

1976 "Number, Timing, and Duration of Marriages and Divorces in the United States: June, 1975." *Current Population Reports*, Series P-20, No. 297. U.S. Government Printing Office.

U.S. Bureau of the Census

1978 "Persons of Spanish Origin in the United States: March 1978." *Current Population Reports*, Series P-20, No. 328 (Advance Report). Washington, D.C : U.S. Government Printing Office.

U.S. Department of Justice

1976 Immigration and Naturalization Annual Report. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

U.S. House of Representatives, Select Committee on Population

1978 *Legal and Illegal Immigration to the United States.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Vergara, Camilo (ed.)

1979 *Planning for Hispanics in Medium-Sized Cities.* Stamford, Connecticut: The Spanish International Center.

Wilber, George L., and Robert Hagan

1975 *Metropolitan and Regional Inequalities Among Minorities in the Labor Market.* Lexington, Kentucky: University of Kentucky.

Wilber, George L., Daniel E. Jaco, Robert J. Hagan, and Alfonso C. del Fierro, Jr.

1975 *Spanish-Americans and Indians in the Labor Market.* Lexington, Kentucky: University of Kentucky.